

7

A
R E P L Y

TO

Dr. SHARP'S REVIEW, &c.

Price Two Shillings.

A

REPLY

TO

Dr. S H A R P's

REVIEW and DEFENCE

OF HIS

DISSERTATIONS

ON THE

SCRIPTURE MEANING

OF

ALEIM and BERITH.

By JULIUS BATE, A. M.

Part. 1.

Whoever attempteth any thing for the Publick, (especially if it pertain to Religion, and to the opening and clearing of the Word of God) the same setteth himself upon a stage to be glouted upon by every *evil eye*; yea, he casteth himself headlong upon pikes to be gored by every sharp tongue. For he that meddleth with mens religion in any part, meddleth with their Custom, nay, with their Freehold; and tho' they find no content in that which they have, yet they cannot think of altering.

The Translators (of the Bible) to the Reader.

LONDON:

Printed for E. WITHERS, at the Seven Stars,
in *Fleetstreet*. MDCCLV.

ERRATA.

Page 3. line 4. *for* ana *read* and ; l. 19. *r.* Dissertations. P. 4. l. 3. *f.* a very *r.* every. P. 7. l. 2. *r.* integritatis ; l. 6. *r.* Doctores ; l. 11. *f.* ut *r.* et. P. 9. l. 17. *f.* where *r.* who. P. 15. l. 8. *r.* pessima. P. 24. l. 17. *f.* לווה *r.* אלוה ; l. ult. *f.* לה *r.* אלה. P. 27. l. 13. *ff* *r.* SS. P. 36. l. 3. *f.* Signification *r.* Translation. P. 37. l. 12. their *r.* the. P. 42. l. 23. הכסף *r.* הכסף. P. 57. l. 5. *dele* self. P. 64. l. 18. him *r.* them. P. 74. l. 21. *r.* ramentum cum. P. 98. l. 25. *f.* Dr. Sharp *r.* and. P. 101. l. 8. *f.* into *r.* in ; l. 23. *r.* that the word *Curse*. P. 109. l. 7. *f.* in the *r.* in that. P. 112. l. 27. *f.* יצר *r.* יצר. P. 117. l. 17. *dele* that. P. 120. l. 5. mandatum *r.* mundatum. P. 123. l. 16. *r.* anomala. P. 141. l. 17. *r.* huffing. P. 146. l. 28. *f.* Kings *r.* Rings. P. 149. l. 30. *r.* instances. P. 166. l. 7. *f.* and *r.* in. P. 184. l. 19. an accurate *r.* inaccurate.



A
R E P L Y
T O

Dr. SHARP'S REVIEW, &c.

IT was with no small degree of impatience we waited for Dr. *Sharp's* Annotations on Mr. *Hutchinson's* Discoveries, which the world had long been in expectation of, from some general hints the learned Gentleman was pleased to throw out on the publication of Mr. *Catcott's* Sermon, with that applause and uncommon mark of Approbation, by the Gentlemen of *Bristol*, at the Assizes there before the present Lord Chancellor in the year 1735. This Sermon gave an alarm.—It was fitting therefore the Cause should be undertaken

ken by a person of abilities to make the best of it, and whose station in life and reputation also might demand the publick attention to what he should please to lay before them : and accordingly the Rev. Doctor undertakes it, and in the year 1751 publishes *two Dissertations* on two words explained by Mr. *Hutchinson*, which he represents as *Corner Stones, and the very vitals as it were of Mr. H.'s whole System*, mistaking a branch for the root of the Tree, and a pinnacle or two of the Temple for the pillars it stood upon. All the advantages that could be desired lay on the side of the Dissertator, and accordingly the Doctor's performance must be allowed to be as compleat and perfect as the most *mature consideration*, great learning and the advice and assistance of friends could render it. It smoothes its way in a Dedication ; bespeaks the reader's favour, and makes its Apology in a Preface ; it pushes the objections almost farther than they will bear, in two set Discourses ; it revises and supplies what was wanting or had slipt notice, in long Notes, and an Appendix, which is still further supplied by an *Addenda* ; and there is yet a *multa desiderantur*. I did myself the Honour to take up the pen on this occasion, and attended the learned Objector thro' every Argument as far as he was to be understood by me ; for some Things there were, I did not then, and after several subsequent perusals cannot yet understand ; and was in hopes I had given no offence, but *managed the Controversy with that Temper and Moderation that might be reasonably expected :*

expected; and can say with equal Sincerity by the Doctor what he does by Mr. C. that *I am not conscious I have made one personal Reflection upon him, but treated him with all due Respect and Decency.* And yet I find by the general Cast of *The Review and Defence*, just published, and some controversial Compliments here and there, and a few *detours* common to the *less-calm* Disputant, that I am not so happy as I was in hopes I had been, having a greater share of the Doctor's resentment than of that humour or γελοιον which makes so good a figure, and takes up so much of his time in the *Dissertations*; but I shall not endeavour to inflame, nor enter into the litigious part further than clearing the subject and justification of the argument shall seem to me to require it.

Mr. *Kalmar*, a foreigner, has published three small tracts in defence of the *Dissertation*, also; a Gentleman not quite so much master of our tongue, and his own temper, as were to be wished; he has picked up a little bad *English*, and is very free with it; and abuses his Opponents in all the variety of terms he is master of: but he seems to have more Sincerity than good Manners; and the grossness of his language to be owing to his want of a choice of words, and ignorance in our phraseology, and happiness of Embellishment in dressing up a Sentence, and saying more than you would be charged with doing; for a Man of more artifice shall vent as much Spleen without giving one ill word, as another shall discover in

the foulest language ; and tho' you do not hear him openly call names and abuse, you shall perceive by a very cast and turn of expression, that he inwardly does so.

The Doctor tells us, *Review* p. 2, that he was for some time determined to make no reply to what myself and two others have wrote in answer to his objections, but leave the dispute to the decision of the Reader, whose judgement in his favour he thought himself secure of, upon a perusal of both sides. And a great part of the dispute must yet be left there where he thought to have left the whole, for the *Review* only dips here and there, and culls out what was thought easiest to be played upon ; and the merits of the Cause, as far as it relates to the *meaning* of the important word in dispute, are almost wholly passed by. *It happened also in a very short time after, that Mr. Kalmar, a learned foreigner, published his defence of the Doctor's Discourses, which though he did suppose his opponents would affect to disregard, yet it contains many good observations ; but not a word have we of the bad ones, or foul treatment ; and such as the Doctor had enter'd his Caveat against ; all this being covered by his Ignorance in the English tongue, and Zeal for a good Cause.*

I have said in my Answer to the Discourses, that I looked upon the *Appendix* as the work of another hand ; which was my real opinion then ; but it seems I am mistaken, it being purely the Doctor's *own both in design and execution*, which
I am

I am sorry for, and ask pardon for attempting to deprive him of the Credit of it. It was upon conjecture indeed that I did suppose so; and upon what else but conjecture does the Doctor charge the Answer to the *Modest Apology* to me as my Work? In ascribing the Appendix and some other parts of the Doctor's book to another Author, I had no design to give offence; and if the *reasoning* in them which I have endeavoured to *explain*, does not deserve the *resentment* I have done it with, the blame will light upon me; tho' I hope that *resentment*, which would as properly have been called *Contempt*, is not too *high*. Disputation is apt to inflame, and if the greatest Care be not taken, the sparks will burst out; but heat is no less heat for being stifled within, nor Anger less Anger for resting in the bosom. But to the Subject.

The Antiquity of the *Hebrew* tongue, on which a great deal depends in this dispute, is most strenuously denied by some learned persons now living, whose Sanction Dr. *Sharp* boasts of, as well as whose aid and assistance he has made use of: and whence his Dissertations have derived that *Correctness* and *Usefulness* they so justly boast of, *Preface* p. 19. these learned Mercuries, having pointed out to him the way of amending what they judged amiss, p. 20. but in this material point almost all the learned before them have judged differently from them. Human authority is a treacherous and inadequate guide to a Searcher after Truth; but as it is only to oppose authority
to

to authority, I shall beg leave to cite the judicious *Leigh*, and the famous *Hulsius* against them, and the judgement of our own Church, or of the Heads of it, as something of a higher Authority.

—*The Apostle excepteth no tongue, not the Hebrew the antientest. The Translators (of our Bible) to the Reader.*

The judicious *Leigh* in his Prefaces to his *Hebrew and Greek Critica Sacra*,

—“ *Hebrew*, the most antient and holy tongue ;
 “ for antiquity it is the tongue of *Adam* ; for sanctity it is the tongue of God. In this tongue God
 “ spake to the Prophets and Patriarchs ; in this
 “ tongue the Angels spoke to Men ;—how many
 “ proper Names in the Scripture are derived from
 “ the *Hebrew*, and how significant are their Etymologies ?

—“ No Translation is absolutely perfect, but
 “ it may and ought to be more perfected.—If
 “ there be any mistakings they must still be corrected
 “ by the fountains themselves. The two Testaments
 “ are the paps of the Church, from which we suck
 “ the sincere milk of the Word.—The old Testament was written in *Hebrew*, which is the
 “ most antient and maternal language, for *Adam* used it, and all Men before the flood, *as is manifest from the Scriptures and Fathers.*—*This language is a borrower from none, and lender to all.* ”

The famous *Hulsius* is as sanguine upon it as any *Hut---n*, and among other things, says,

“ Sic

“ Sic itaque palam fit, primam illam linguam,
 “ quâ nemo in felicissimo illo integritati statu usus
 “ est, neminem præter ipsum Deum habuisse Au-
 “ thorem ; quæ vero illa fuerit non operose nobis
 “ est investigandum, *omnes enim uno ore clamitant*
 “ *Hebræorum Doctore ex priscis patribus nullus est*
 “ *qui negat* ; inter modernos quocunque titulo chris-
 “ tianam religionem profiteantur, *nemo alicujus fa-*
 “ *mæ aut nominis existit qui unquam in dubium vo-*
 “ *caverit*, hæbreæ illam fuisse et non aliam. Nec
 “ autoritatibus tantum hic pugnatur, sed ut argu-
 “ menta artificialia quamplurima pro veritate istâ
 “ militant. — Adeo ut qui contrarium asserere ausus
 “ fuerit, principium neget ; immo *impotentis cere-*
 “ *bri esse videatur.* *Oratio* p. 8.

Dr. *Sharp* asserts the direct contrary of all this,
 and expects his bare word should pass for it, unless
 its being backed by some unknown friends, *who*
are clear in their opinions against the Hebrew being
the language of Paradise, or even the native lan-
guage of Abraham, (Review p. 22.) be an additi-
 onal weight to it.

— “ We must be content with our ignorance,
 “ as we must, says the Doctor, in many other points
 “ concerning the *Hebrew* language, which are nei-
 “ ther determined in Scripture, nor by any sufficient
 “ and undoubted authority : as for instance, whe-
 “ ther it be the language of Paradise and the Ante-
 “ diluvians, or &c.” *Differ.* p. 72, and p. 90.
 “ —mere presumption that *Hebrew* is the original
 “ language ;” and yet the Doctor is pleased to say
Review p. 23.

“ I have

“ I have not hitherto declared any opinion of my
 “ own, but I am so far from being prejudiced against
 “ the commonly received notions about the antiqui-
 “ ty of this language---when there shall appear
 “ sufficient evidence, that &c.

This looks like declaring his opinion that we must be *content with our ignorance about the antiquity of the Hebrew*; that we have *not sufficient authority* to determine us; that it is a *mere presumption*; else why is this asserted, if it was not his opinion? It is the belief, it seems, of *the Fathers*; of our own Church; and of the Learned in general, which in some cases is urged as a sufficient authority; however will amount to more than a *mere presumption*; and the Doctor forgets himself, as well with regard to *his own opinion*, as to other people's. Why a Gentleman of so much learning and modesty should venture an *ipse dixit* in so material a case against the current opinion, and against all the best writers on the subject, I cannot tell, he no doubt can.

They are pleased to charge Mr. *Hutchinson* and his followers with being sanguine, dogmatical and strangers to that deference due to *great men*, and the opinions of others; with other such insinuations that tend naturally to prejudice the Reader against them, and raise those suspicions and emotions in the mind, under which no cause can have a fair and impartial hearing. Such treatment flows from the very spirit it seems to condemn, and gives just suspicion, that either they do not know their own hearts, or have a mind
 2 that

that others should not; for surely it is want of a proper deference to *all the best Authors*, (to use the words of the great *Ravis*) to *the Fathers*, and to our own Church, to contradict them all, without any reason assigned. A good and sanctimonious Christian can't allow himself, but now and then, to abuse in his own person, or in plain terms; but he may do it in the *less direct way*, by innuendo's and at second hand; the motto in the Doctor's title page, seems of this sort, and to shew, as he says, *quorundum illiberale judicium, qui sic addicti sunt certis hominibus ut dissentientem ab iis neminem ferant licet interim ipsi a toto christiano orbe dissentiant*. It is wonderful that the Doctor did not see it was his own case; except that his attachment is to *incertis hominibus*, for nobody knows where they are; but they are *positive* against the sense of the whole *christian world*; and have drawn him into the same singularity of sentiment. And tho' he is pleased to say, *Review* p. 24.

“ Nothing has been yet said by any of my Opponents, on this article that helps at all towards clearing it up; see Mr. *Bate*, p. 88. Mr. *Hol-*
loway, p. 14. Mr. *Moody*, p. 92.”

yet authorities and reasons too, are produced by them, which should have had a fair hearing, before this had been asserted, which looks too like what is so much condemned in others. Mr. *Hutchinson* has a Treatise purposely on this subject, with many large quotations in it; which we may be allowed to

refer an Opponent to: and which his *Arabic* friend was no stranger to.

And if the *Hebrew* were the language of Paradise, and the Ante-diluvians there can be no *kindred tongue* to search for the *root* of *Aleim* in, tho' the Doctor censure me for saying so, *Reviews* p. 16.

“ because the nations round about the *Jews*—

“ spoke languages which had a considerable affi-

“ nity with the *Hebrew*. ”

But where should these nations find this lost root; it never came down to the *Jews*! who then preserved it during the interval of its being lost, and the rise of these kindred tongues? had it come down to the *Jews*, and from them to the nations round about them, they would doubtless have made use of it on some occasion or other, in the sense the *Alcoran* does. It is a common word, I mean a word of the same letters was in common use from *Adam* to the Captivity, in a *quite different* sense from that the *Alcoran* gives it, and which said *Alcoranish* sense is not that I know of found in any of the kindred tongues, or among the nations round about the *Jews*; and it is never used, in the sense contended for, by the *Hebrews*, whom the word originally belonged to. But when I said *there is no kindred tongue to search for the root of Aleim in*, it is evidently my meaning that there was no kindred tongue of Antiquity enough; not that the *Phænician*, *Syriac* or *Chaldee* may not be called kindred

dred tongues, which the Doctor makes me say. I would not say, that he purposely mistakes me, but had he purposely done so, he could not have been further from my obvious meaning. But a root that was once *Hebrew*, tho' retained in *Arabic* or the *Alcoran*, ceases to be *Hebrew* any longer; it is now become *Arabic*; and unless the ideal meaning and sense which the *Hebrews* fixed to the word whilst in use among them grew so close to it, as not to be separated from it, we are not a jot the nearer *that sense* by finding the sound in another Dialect forged a thousand years afterwards. And therefore the point in dispute here turns on this question, which has been often put to our Opponents, but never answered, see Script. Meaning p. 89. *We have often called in this dispute upon those who propose the Arabic sense of the words that sound like the Hebrew, for the sense of those Hebrew words, to give any reason why we should think that the Mahometans use them in the same sense the Prophets did? but not a word of answer is vouchsafed; nor do I believe will be, tho' ever so often repeated. Did Mr. Bedford, or does Mr. Kilmar, or the Doctor endeavour to answer it? No. And therefore if they find the root or word in Arabic, they have but a sound without a (Hebrew) meaning, till they can prove the Hebrews used it in the same sense. And this I apprehend is sufficient to set this Arabic Derivation aside, or the Arabic Construction of this or any other Hebrew word, in the Scriptures. Other tongues use some words in the same sense the Hebrews did;*

did; but we must have proof of it in any particular word, before the supposition can be argued upon, and a logical conclusion be drawn from it.

“ Where is the improbability that in this *Medley*,
 “ or Hodge-podge of languages (or by whatever
 “ other contemptible name it be called) some
 “ roots, *genuine Hebrew*, tho’ not extant in the
 “ tongue as we now have it, may be met with?”

Review p. 17, 18.

Suppose the root to be there we shall still want the original meaning. And a word without a meaning, is *vox et præterea nihil*. Numbers of words originally *Hebrew* are to be met with in *English*, and in other languages, as well as in *Arabic*; but they are not *Hebrew* now, having changed their country and kindred, and may or may not be used in the sense the Prophets used them; some of them are, which we can prove by their usage in the Prophets; but where such authority fails us, we are at a loss for the original sense, tho’ we should have the original word. Words very frequently change their signification in a course of time at home, without travelling abroad; but when they are transported into another country, it is very natural to suppose them to change as other things do, with the climate. The reverend and ingenious † Dr. *Gregory Sharp*, gives a very diverting instance to my purpose, in the word *Pistol*. The *Arabic*

* See his Treatise on the Structure of the *Hebrew* Tongue.

is a mixture of many languages, and forged by *Mahomet* with the help of an apostate *Jew*, above a *thousand years* after *Hebrew* had ceased to be a living language, and consequently there could be *no genuine Hebrew* then but what was in writing; and all that is extant of *Hebrew* is now, and was then, as far as we know to the contrary, in the Bible; thither therefore we must go for our *Hebrew*, and not to the *Alcoran* *. And here perhaps it may not be so improper as represented, to enquire into the antiquity, and perfection of the *Arabic* tongue; which if it fail in either of these respects, will be but a treacherous guide to us in our way to the *Hebrew*. And the Doctor, with all due submission, is mistaken when he says,

“ the point turns on this question *only*, and not
 “ on the antiquity and perfection of the *Arabic*. ” p. 20.

The question turns on this point, what certainly we have that the same Sound, (supposing it to be the same) in the mouths of different people, in different countries, and at *great distance* of time, carried the same meaning with it. I would not be thought to suppose that adopted words never carry their original sense with them, but I ask for proof, in this or any other particular word, which may justify the argument they build on it. There may be no small difficulty in some words to determine what *Hebrew* such an *Arabic* one

* See *Confusion of Tongues*, p. 137, *et seq.* Edit. *Hod.*
 stood

stood for, which will also require to be cleared up; and when these two points are settled, neither of which have been determined but upon *conjecture* only, with regard to Aleim, Cherubim, &c. it will be time enough to give them an *Arabic* sense, and construe the word of God, by the words and forgeries of Antichrist.

The Doctor cites me from p. 89. where I refer to the *Testamentum Jacobi*, and other attempts to lose the Scriptures in the confusion of Arabic, enough to give a man of sense a surfeit, and fill the mind of a Christian with horror, which he need not have taken to himself, but have left to the person it is plainly designed for; and to whom I wish there were no room to apply it. If the Doctor think I am too free in the Censure, let him or any man who has a due regard for the honour of the Scriptures read over *the Jacob's will*, some Oration on *Arabic*, and also the first Dissertation of the Rev. Mr. Costard on *Ezek. xiii. ver. 18.* where that profound and ingenious Critic by a surprising penetration, only with the help of the *Arabic*, has discovered the original foundation of *The Act for the preservation of the Game at Babylon*,—in a concise dilucidation of the word כְּטָה between p. 9 and 23 only, and then censure me as he pleases. But I did not design this for Dr. Sharp; nor to insinuate that he laid his main stress upon the *Arabic* Derivation; but still he lays a great deal more upon the *Arabic*, than he has given any reason to justify, and particularly in *Review* p. 57. where the authority of the *Arabic* is so great,

great, that an *Hebrew* word must have two roots, because an *Arabic* word has two significations. But if *Arabic*, as they call it, be only the language of the *Alcoran*, it is neither *old enough*, nor *pure enough*, to be capable of helping us, or fit to be trusted. It is indeed a *corrupted Hebrew*, and so far corrupted as to verify the proverb *corruptio optimi fit pessime*. To the *Hebrew Bible* then we must go for the Etymology of *Aleim*, which was a name of God in Paradise, and in the old Testament frequently used and emphatically on many occasions; and it is a name given by the Prophets to the sons of the most High, his Vice-gerents on Earth; and in whatever sense it is construed, it must be in such a one as is applicable to man, as well as to God. The *Arabic Alaba* cannot be that sense, because man is not adorable or to be worshipped. It was from the application of this name, and the *Hebrew* etymology shews the propriety of the application, that our Lord silenced the *Sadducees* and proved to them the Resurrection of the Dead. All the mercy promised to lost man is summed up in this title, when God gives it as a reason of his coming down to deliver the Seed of *Abraham*, and by that a promise to deliver all the children of the faith of Abraham, out of bondage, because he was the *Aleim of Abraham*.

This glorious and fearful name has exercised the pens of many writers; not a few of whom have endeavoured to derive it from *Ale* a Curse, Imprecation, or Bann, which those three *Hebrew*
letters

letters are so often used for. And it is more than probable they had robbed Mr. *Hutchinson* of the honour of the construction, had it not been *pointed* for a *participle passive*, in which part of speech it cannot be applied to all the three persons of *Jehovah*, one only of those ever-blessed persons having taken the curse upon him that is due to man.

All agree that this word is plural, and its termination in *im*, as well as its *singular Ale*, would put this out of doubt, were there not verbs, participles, nouns and pronouns in the plural number connected with it likewise. It has its passive *Alue* often used as a name of *Jehovah* in the *singular number*, but never in the plural.

Aleim we fetch from *Ale*, which as an action performed, is a *Curse denounced for*, or *as*, an *Oath*, a *Curse* conditionally imprecated being the constituent part of an *Oath*. The manner of swearing among the Antients was somewhat different from ours; the form of their *Oaths* frequently occurs in Scripture; and tho' the words must of course vary, as the *Curse* denounced, was designed to bind others only; themselves only; or all in general, where the speaker included himself of course; yet an *Oath was given* and *taken* by denouncing a *Curse*; and when two Parties were to be sworn, or the person who denounced the *Curse* was himself to be laid under the obligation of it, he spoke in such general words, as included himself and them he spoke to in the same words; an instance or two from Scripture will set this matter in a clear light. Josh. vi. 26.

and

and Joshua שבע swore, or, *adjured* [sc. all persons] at *that time*, saying, *Cursed be the man before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this City Jericho*. Here *swearing* is saying, *Cursed be*; and Joshua *adjured* or *swore himself*, as much as he did every body else. His words were an Oath to himself, as much as to others; for had he risen up and built Jericho, he would have incurred the Curse which was denounced against *any one* that should build it. Jud. xxi. 18. *The children of Israel have sworn, saying, Cursed be he that giveth a wife to Benjamin*. 1 Sam. xiv. 24. *Saul had adjured the people, saying, Cursed be the man that eateth food until the evening*; ver. 28. *Thy father straitly charged the people with an Oath, saying, Cursed be the man that eateth food this day*. In both these instances we have the same form of *swearing*, by denouncing a Curse; and the Persons who *adjured* others, *adjured themselves*, or took their own Oath, and gave one to others in the same words. He who said, *Cursed be the man that giveth a wife to Benjamin*, was equally sworn with those to whom he spoke these words. And Saul, when he adjured the people, saying, *Cursed be he that eateth*, did give his own Oath to fast himself; and it is plain from the event, that Saul thought himself as much under Oath, as he did the people.

The most common words used for an Oath or *Swearing* in Scripture are from the root שבע, which doth not *literally* express a Curse, as אלה confessedly does; this latter word occurs about

forty times in Scripture; and, “ in about thirty
 “ of those places, (say the Differ. p. 35.) it sig-
 “ nifies simply a Curse or penalty of an Oath.---
 “ It doth indeed signify an Oath, and may be
 “ so rendered; yet it is not necessarily to be un-
 “ derstood in his (Mr. C's.) *sense of Oath*, where-
 “ by one binds one's self to the performance of
 “ any thing, but may be understood, and in some
 “ Texts must be understood, in the sense of *Ad-*
 “ *jurat*ion, whereby one binds another to the per-
 “ formance of a thing by the *Sanction of an Oath*. ”
 i. e. *by a Curse denounced*. And the Doctor un-
 dertakes to shew both in his *Dissertations*, and
Review; that *Ale* is a Curse denounced upon o-
 thers, *Differ.* p. 12 and 25, *Review* p. 104. in
 contradistinction to an *Oath properly speaking*;
 and chuses the word *Adjuration* as a proper con-
 struction of *Ale*, which excludes the ground of
 the Etymology Mr. *Hutchinson* gives of *Aleim*:
 for according to Mr. *Hutchinson* and Mr. C. God
 was *really sworn* to his people; which if God
 was; and *Ale* will admit of the *Curse or penalty*
of an Oath being applied to one's self; or in o-
 ther words, if a Person may lay himself under a
 Curse, or subject himself conditionally to the pe-
 nalty of an Oath, then *Aleim* may be rightly
 construed; and the name of God taken from the
 relation betwixt him and his people arising from
 their being under a *Curse or Ale* with him.

I agree with Dr. *Sharp* so far that *Ale* is a *Curse*
denounced; but why upon *others only*? what is
 there in the signification of the word that limits
 it

it to *others*? a *Curse is a Curse*, whether denounced upon *myself*, or upon others; or upon *all* in general. And if it be the *penalty of an Oath*, as the Doctor does acknowledge, it must be applicable to an *Oath properly speaking*, or an *Oath which a person himself takes*, as well as to an Oath which is administer'd to another; unless an Oath a person takes himself has no penalty annexed to it. If the words of the Curse are limited, so is the Oath; if general, so is the Oath. He that denounced the words of the Curse, might or might not be sworn; and we must consider the words he spoke to see whether he included himself under the Curse or not.

The grand Contest betwixt Mr. *Hutchinson* and his Opponents is, whether that which *Deut. xxix. 12.* is called God's *Ale*, were properly speaking an *Oath to God*; or he did only *adjure*, or denounce a Curse on the people; a dispute that one would think might be settled in a few words; and had long ago been ended, would the Gentlemen have condescended to look at the words God spake when he did *adjure* the people; God said, (conf. *Deut. xxvii. ult.* with *Jer. xi. 2---5.*) *Cursed be every one that confirmeth not all the words of this Law, or Covenant*; which extends to every part of the Law; and takes in every party in the Covenant. God had words to perform as well as the people; and if saying *Cursed be*, was an Oath to the people, it must be an Oath to God; because it is not limited to others here, but extended to all, to *every one* who had

D 2

any

any thing to do in it. If this Denunciation was an Oath to the Children of *Israel*, it must be an Oath to God who spoke it, because it says *every one*, וְכָל; it was an Oath therefore to *every one* who had any part in the Law, any words in the Covenant to perform. And God who denounced it bound himself by denouncing it, and the people bound themselves by saying Amen to it. It was, as *Deut. xxvi. 17.* their *avouching the Lord to be their God*; and *God's avouching them to be his peculiar people as he had promised them*—upon oath; *Num. xiv. 16.* *The land which he swore unto them.* *Deut. xxviii. 9.* *The Lord shall establish thee as an holy people unto himself, as he has sworn unto thee.* Every member of the Church of God has a full assurance that God will perform his part of the Covenant, because he has himself denounced a Curse against every one that doth not keep his part: and God was as much sworn by this *Denunciation*, of which he himself was the speaker, by his Delegates, as those Delegates themselves, or the rest of the people were. That such a Curse was an Oath is plain from the passages above. That it included or extended the obligation to the person of God who spoke it, is plain from the words. That God's *Ale*, which they are said to enter into *with* God, refers to this *Curse*, or these words, I imagine, will not be denied. Compare them, and *Deut. xxix. 12, 13.* with *Jer. xi. 2.* *Hear ye the words of this Covenant,---and say thou unto them, Thus says the Lord God of Israel, Cursed be the man that obey-*
eth

eth not the words of this Covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace, saying, obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you : so shall ye be my people and I will be your God. That I may perform the Oath which I have sworn unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey, as it is this day. Then answered I, and said, Amen, O Lord. This Curse, we see then, was not confined to the particulars mentioned from the 15th to the 26th of *Deut.* xxvii. but reached to the whole Law, as ver. 8 and ver. 10. *The Commandments and Statutes* : Nor was it confined to that particular declaration of it upon mount *Ebal*, but was the same which God spake to their fathers, in the day that he brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, at *Horeb*, which was renewed with them in the land of *Moab*, just before they went over *Jordan*, and was to be solemnly repeated, at *Ebal*, beyond *Jordan*. These are the words of the Covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the Children of Israel in the land of *Moab*, beside the Covenant which he made with them in *Horeb*. *Deut.* xxix. 1. When Mr. *Hutchinson*, and those who read his writings define *Ale* to be an Oath with Cursing, and say that אלהו (*Deut.* xxix. 12.) is God's Oath properly speaking ; and this is opposed seemingly under a thorough conviction, one would think it must be owing to the Opponents having a wrong state of the case before their eyes, as thinking an
Oath

Oath must be sworn in the same manner we give or swear ours: a *reciprocal Oath*, or Oath binding to two parties, (the Speaker and the persons spoken to,) made in the same words, or at once speaking, is a thing not in use with us; any more than the *execratory* form is. But no man will say, I trust, that the *Ale* was not God's Oath in the *proper sense* of the word, because it was an Oath to the people likewise. Or that God was not sworn by those words, because the people were sworn by them too. The Curse, which God denounced, extended its obligation as much to himself as it did to any one else. There is nothing to limit it. God says, *Cursed be* שׁוֹנֵה he, or *every one*, that &c. And this single passage of Scripture with its parallel place, is sufficient to shew the meaning of *Ale*, when used for an Oath; and why it is said to be God's *Ale with his people*, as laying the obligation of an Oath on both in the same words; and we see here the connection and relation, the mutual and reciprocal obligation betwixt Jehovah and his people, whence he is stiled their *Aleim*, because he brought them into an *Ale* with himself. The propriety and beauty of this Etymology will want no words to set it forth when it is shewn that the *Ale* laid an obligation on both parties, and bound God to his people, and the people to God. And whoever considers what the Bann, Imprecation or solemn Curse of God or his Vicegerents meant, or how they gave their own Oaths, and administered one to others, will soon see that אֱלֹהִים, as a *personal noun*, is *one who*
has

has laid himself, and them he has power over, under the obligation of an Oath, for it literally, as a *Hebrew word*, signifies, the Speaker of a Curse, who was himself bound by it, as well as those he spoke it to. And therefore for Jehovah to be *Aleim* to his people, means, answering the engagement he was under to them by the Curse denounced; as the people's having Jehovah for their *Aleim*, means, acknowledging that they were under an engagement by Oath to him.

I must remark another thing, which I apprehend, has led the Doctor and his friend Mr. *Kalmar* into some wrong reasoning, and indeed into most of it under this head, and which will have a very bad influence when the rule about the *same-ness* of *Idea* in *Hebrew* words comes to be considered; what I presume to blame in these Gentlemen is, taking into the meaning of a word that which is only accidental to it; or affixing that to a word as part of its sense which is only its *Epithet*; as, *Cursing* is Cursing, whatever species or kind, the Curse spoke of, is to be ranked under; whether it be spoke in a rash manner, lightly and for no sufficient reason; or in malice and ill will; or conditionally, on a solemn and serious occasion; the sense and meaning of the word is still the same, tho' it be used on *different occasions*. And from this inaccuracy does Dr. *Sharp* conclude that the sense of *Ale* is *a Curse denounced on others*, because the Curse in some of the places he refers to was denounced on others. And this makes him say, that this word *occurs indeed often*
and

and in senses not the same. Because I suppose the *Curſing* ſpoke of in one place is *prophane* Curſing; in another *malicious*; in another *judicial*; in another *juratory*. And from this different *application* of the word he concludes it has different meanings; and that Translators and Commentators conſtrue the word differently becauſe they are not agreed what Curſe is ſpoke of in this or that particular place; and hence I apprehend it is that He argues againſt us as *departing* from the ſenſe we give *Ale* in one place, becauſe we ſometimes call it a *Curſe*; ſometimes an *Oath given*, ſometimes an *Oath taken*; and in another part of ſpeech, *Covenanters*, *Confederates*, *Allies*, *ſworn friends*, or the like. And thus the Curſe our Saviour underwent was *vicarious*, tho' the word לֹוָה * or Καταρα, doth not ſignify a *vicarious* Curſe.

I have endeavoured to ſettle the difference betwixt שְׁבוּעָה and אֵלֶּה *, which whatever the Reader may think of mine, he will eaſily ſee that the diſtinction laid down by *Avenarius*, *Robertſon* and ſome other learned men betwixt thoſe words, as alſo betwixt *promiſſory* and *execratory* Oaths, will not hold; for Oaths were *taken* and *given*, and Covenants as well as Promiſes were confirmed by declaring a Curſe againſt the party that ſhould prove falſe, and what is called a *Curſe* in one place is called an *Oath* in another. We ſee from the paſſages above that שְׁבוּעָה was attended with a Curſe or Imprecation as well as לֹוָה * ---

* Script. mean. p. 77.

They swore, saying, Cursed be. These two words stand together as relative to the same transaction, and the Imprecation in which brought down the wrath of God on *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, because of their disobedience, or for transgressing the Law, *Dan. ix. 11.* *Therefore the Curse is poured upon us, and the Oath written in the Law of Moses.* No other Oath is written in the Law of *Moses* but that Curse or Imprecation above-mentioned. The learned men, referred to, say, that *אלה* is
 “ *juramentum execrationis, quo quis se astringit*
 “ *cum imprecatione mali*—at *שבועה* est tantum
 “ *juramentum sine imprecatione mali.*”

Surprising that such judicious men could fall into this mistake, when an Oath is so often defined to be, *saying, Cursed be, so and so.* And the distinction must be in the *radical* or literal meaning of the words, not in the nature of the Oath, they are used for. I have the pleasure and *honour*, of thinking with *Dr. Sharp* in this respect, that both words imply *an imprecation of evil.* *Differ. p. 25.*

“ *אלה* is a *Curse* denounced upon others ;

“ *שבועה* an imprecation of evil upon *one's self.*”

But tho' both words, or rather, tho' an Oath, whichever of the words be used, imply *an imprecation*, either expressed or understood, yet there does not seem sufficient reason for saying that *שבועה* is a *self-imprecation*, any more than that *אלה* is an imprecation *on others* ; and I apprehend is grounded upon the same mistake or inaccuracy before complained of ; and the not duly
 E attending

attending to the *wording* of the Curse that was denounced *for*, or *as*, an Oath. There is nothing in שְׁבוּעָה that signifies *self*; if there were, it could *never* be used for an imprecation *on others*: and therefore if Oath, in its proper sense, as the *act* of the person who swears, be the more usual, it is not the more proper meaning of שְׁבוּעָה. The word is *so often* used for an Oath administered to others, that if it be *oftner* used for an Oath taken by one's self, that is not a satisfactory reason for such distinction;—Saul *adjured* the people, saying, *Cursed be*—and the people feared the Oath. Oath then was an *imprecation* of Evil upon others, as well as upon one's self. It is to be suspected that this over nice construction of שְׁבוּעָה was thought of to set the better colour upon the interpretation of Ale as an *adjuration*, which is the masked Battery whence Mr. Hutchinson's Etymology of Aleim is played upon; for if the sense of Ale as an Oath given and taken, a reciprocal obligation, can be retained in that important name of God, tho' we may have no adequate phrase in *English*; the most material objections, as well as mistakes, about it, that have been as yet laid before the Reader, will be easily cleared up: and the foreign derivation, and mutable ה, will scarce deserve a hearing.

But we shall have occasion to enter more particularly and more largely, into the discussion of those passages of Scripture where these words are used; for I must here pay my attendance to Dr. Sharp, who in his *Review*, makes a *shew* of confuting

futing this account of *Ale*, and the definition of an Oath which I have laid down, and proved from the Text to be the truth of the Case. And I shall begin with his Enquiry into the sense and meaning of *Ale*, which the Doctor enters upon Sect. III.

And here the Doctor cites Mr. *Aboab*, Mr. *Moody* and myself, all agreeing, that

“ *אלה* may and sometimes does, signify what he
 “ said it did. And adds, it seems at first sight,
 “ as if Mr. C.’s assertion that *Alab*——signi-
 “ fies as a noun an Oath, and that it always oc-
 “ curs in it in this sense, Serm. p. 8. was given
 “ up by these three Gentlemen.” p. 69.

But does Mr. C. say or hint, Serm. p. 8. that it doth not signify to swear another, or adjure? or does Mr. *Hutchinson*’s Etymology of *Aleim* require him to say so? Mr. C. says, it signifies an Oath, and an Oath is an Oath whether given or taken; which the three Gentlemen above would have persuaded the Doctor to have consider’d, but as this would have invalidated all the use he has made of his distinction betwixt Oath and Adjuration, he doth not chuse to do it, but would rather possess his Reader with a notion that his Opponents have been forced to make a concession that gives up that, in the defence of which they are writing. But one look at what the three Gentlemen have wrote on this head will convince the Reader that they have been driven to no such hard shifts. That Mr. C. did not confine Oath or *Ale* to a person’s own Oath, is plain from

his definition—to confirm by oath, to bind a person to fulfil certain terms under a conditional malediction. And the instances he refers to are some of them such as at first sight imply that the Curse was denounced on others.—*If a Soul hear the voice of Swearing—if an Oath, Alah, be laid on him, to cause him to swear.* Can Mr. C. be supposed to think that an Oath laid on a man by the High Priest, was not an Oath laid on another person? and if the supposition that Mr. C. meant by *Alah* an Oath taken by a person himself only, was one of the things against which the Doctor excepted, and which he undertook to disprove, he has a wrong notion, as I have shewn before, of the state of the Case; and taken up the Pen upon a mistake.

In this paragraph the Doctor only says, *it seems at first sight*; it is only a seeming concession there, which at a second look might appear otherwise; but in the next Sentence there is no doubt at all about it, and it is spoke of as certain,

“ But the Author of the Christian Plan, aware

“ of the Consequences of this Concession----- ”

as if it had been a *Concession*, or any thing different from what the general definition or construction of *Ale* in the Lexicons, which they cite and argue upon, does require; and what Mr. C. refers to those Texts *Serm. p. 8.* for, is only to shew that the word carries the idea of an Oath or Execration with it. And what the Doctor argues against Mr. *Moody, Review p. 1.* that

“ Mr. *Hutchinson* to make his argument conclu-

“ five

“ five to the purpose of his Etymology of *Elo-*
 “ *him* ought to have proved that *Alab* is confined
 “ to his sense of *taking an Oath*, ”
 is only arguing upon the old mistake; from not
 considering the *wording* of the Curse which is
 called *Ale*. Mr. *Hutchinson* gives *Execration*,
 (*conditionally denounced, to bind in Covenant*) as the
 ground of his Etymology of this name of God.
 See *Hebrew Writings perfect*, Edit. 1734. and
Execration, as the ideal signification of the word.
 p. 312. 313. “ The word אלה, (as a verb, jurare,
 “ adjurare, pejerare) with its deflections, alone is
 “ construed, imprecatio, execratio, maledictio, ju-
 “ ramentum, jusjurandum, perjurium, — *once*
 “ *right*; Deut. xxix. 21. Secundum omnes execra-
 “ tiones pacti scripti in libro legis istius. — putting
 “ and declaring themselves under a conditional
 “ Execration, for the assurance and comfort to
 “ men. ” And observes, p 317. that *seve-*
ral have come near the sense of this name, but, for
want of the ideal signification of the word, could not
get through. Namely from not considering that an
 Execration conditionally denounced was an Oath
 to men, and might be so to God: but it was *pointed*
 for a *passive*, which forbids this interpretation.

“ My first and *principal point*, says the Doctor,
 “ p. 72, seems to be yielded by the majority of
 “ my Opponents, *viz.* that adjuring or adminis-
 “ tering an Oath is a proper and scriptural sense
 “ of אלה. ”

He has then made that *his first and principal point*,
 which has nothing to do in the dispute: all that
 I we

we have to maintain is that *Ale* is an Oath with Cursing, or a Curse denounced for, or as, an Oath; and that the Curse which God denounced at making his Covenant with the people of *Israel*, was an Oath to himself; and a Curse denounced for an Oath to another, is an Oath still; and unless there were something in the *literal meaning* of the word that confined it to this or that species of Swearing, the proving that *adjuring* is a proper and scriptural sense of the word, is proving for, not against, us. An *Adjuration* may certainly be called a Curse, because it was one; and so may an Oath for the same reason. Mr. *Kalmar*, a learned foreigner, does plainly allow that an Oath may be called *Ale* because of the *Execration* in it; in his answer to me p. 14.

“ It is true sometime the Covenanters, binding
 “ themselves to the performance of the Cove-
 “ nant, swear and use such words which will im-
 “ ply some idea of a Bann, Curse or Execration:
 “ but it cannot be said, that they always, or all
 “ the Covenanters whatsoever do so too; there-
 “ fore it would be most improper to think, that
 “ אלה must be render'd *Execration*, wherever
 “ and whenever it is used.”

Wherever and whenever therefore the Covenanters did bind themselves or swear in such words as imply the idea of a Bann, Curse or Execration in them, it follows according to this Gentleman that אלה is rightly interpreted an *Execration*; and that the Covenanters sometimes swore, or bound themselves, by an *Ale* to the performance of the Cove-
 nant.

These acknowledgments of our foreign and learned friend, prove all that we desire; for from those places of Scripture, whence it appears they did use words that imply a Curse or Bann, we gather also that it was *customary* to use such words when they swore, adjured, or ratified their Covenants. This Gentleman, who has *made some good observations*, observes rightly here, that an *Oath* was called an *Execration* or *Ale* from the words that carry an idea of a Curse in them, not because that Curse was denounced on another. And that an *Ale* was sometimes used to confirm a Covenant, and bind the Covenanters to performance. All that the exception of this learned Gentleman amounts to is, that whenever they took an Oath, or swore to the performance of a Covenant without using such words as implied the idea of a Bann or Curse, such Oath was not an *Ale*, which I readily grant; but do not think such an instance can be found; for an Oath whether given or taken, expresses or implies a Curse or penal Sanction annexed to it. In the Oath or *Ale* betwixt God and *Israel* in the wilderness; in that of the High Priest on all who were privy to theft, private injury, &c. in *Joshua's* Oath or שבוועה about the building of *Jericho*; *Israel's* about giving *Benjamin* wives; *Saul's* about the fast, and others that might be cited, execratory words are used, consequently these Oaths are properly denominated by אלה; and I conclude from hence, that whenever an Oath or Adjuration is called אלה, it is because such execratory words were used

used or sufficiently implied; and I apprehend that the first and principal point the Doctor has to prove, according to his definition, is that אלה is a Curse on others, *not on one's self*: not that a Curse on others is called *Ale*: that *adjuring or administering* an Oath is a proper and *scriptural sense* of אלה, as it is used, is true to the Ear and false to the mind; unless *e. g. a carriage* signifies a coach because a coach is a carriage; or *an Oath* signifies an Adjuration, because an Adjuration is an Oath. It is true that the Scripture *properly* calls that אלה which was an *Oath administer'd*, but it is not therefore true that *Oath administer'd* is the proper sense of אלה. This fallacy, an undesigned one, I hope and believe, is the main pillar, or, in the Doctor's more correct and elegant phrase, *the very vitals of his whole System*; for if the word, as Mr. Kalmar allows, p. 14. *signifies sometimes mere and simple adjuring, or taking an Oath, sometimes cursing, and sometimes both together*, the foundation of our reasoning stands immovable.

So that what the Doctor calls his *first and principal point*, and which he thinks

“ possibly without a close and strict examination
 “ of the word had not been conceded,” p. 72.
 is what Mr. C. builds upon; and from those passages proves that *Ale* as a noun, is *an Oath with Cursing*.

The *perplexity* the Doctor has thrown us into, as he says,

“ how to adjust this sense of *Adjuring* to Mr.
 “ *Hutchinson's*

“ *Hutchinson's sole Exposition* by swearing to a
 “ Covenant,”

is a mist before his own eyes; he didn't see that *adjuring* was called אלה because of the Curse; and that he who pronounced the words of the Curse was sworn himself by those words that laid the obligation on every body. And that when he talked of Mr. *Hutchinson's sole Exposition by swearing*, he was talking without book, and giving you the sentiments of an Author he had not read.

This confusion of Ideas with regard to an Oath and the manner of swearing among the anti-ents, has produced several pages of the less serious sort of writing, which seem designed to divert the Reader and lead his thoughts from the point in dispute, and avoid the danger of considering the merits of the Cause with candour and sobriety.

“ Mr. *Bate*, says the facetious Doctor, engages
 “ to shew that to execrate and adjure are the same
 “ thing, p. 53.—*Swearing* is the same thing
 “ with *adjuring*, and *adjuring* is the same
 “ with *cursing*,—and thus as they have repre-
 “ sented the matter, they agree with me and I
 “ with them. For tho' there be *the appearance*
 “ of three different senses in the three different
 “ renderings into *English*, yet according to these
 “ Gentlemen (*and to speak the truth, tho' I must*
 “ *some how or other make my escape here according*
 “ *to myself too*) they all come to the same thing in
 “ the *Hebrew*.—*and in common sense; but I*
 F didn't

“ *didn't think of being pinned down to it. And*
 “ *that it would set aside all my objections, and clear*
 “ *the dispute of all the perplexities we had involv-*
 “ *ed it in.* ”

It is true we agree with the Doctor in what he endeavours to make himself merry with ; — that *swearing is the same thing with adjuring, and adjuring with cursing* ; for he himself defines *Adjuration* to be a *Curse denounced on others* ; and owns that he that was adjured, was sworn. So that according to his account, *adjuring* is the same thing with *swearing*. and *swearing* with *cursing*, and there seems but little foundation for censure on this head ; and less for the titter his words break forth in. I am glad to see however that the Gentleman can let himself down, and be merry with—nothing.

——“ I have however been instrumental, says he, in the production of new lights—.” p. 74.

The light seems to break in upon him, but here is no new light produced, unless it be to himself. Mr. *Hutchinson* all along considered an Oath as a *Curse denounced*, and so does Dr. *Sharp* himself—in his *Dissertations* before an unlucky use had been made of this definition of an Oath.

The Doctor must have been very inattentive to what he undertook to confute, if he really thinks that it is Mr. Bate who produces at length the *primary sense*, *Curse*, from whence those *secondary senses* of *Swearing*, and *Oath* are branched off. It is commonly explained so; the Doctor, who did not consider just then what an Oath was, thought he

he had got an insuperable objection to Mr. *Hutchinson's* construction of *Aleim*, from his construing *Alue*, a person execrated, and I remarked to him, what seems to be the sense of all the Translators, Commentators and Lexicographers together, that, as *Leigh* says, *verbum hoc proprie execrari significat, et per metonymiam jurare, quia jusjurandum cum execratione jungi solet*. If I am so happy as to have produced any new light, the Doctor may enjoy it his own way; it was in this light I saw *Ale* as an Oath before I writ the Examiner Examined, tho' he appeal to that to prove me inconsistent with myself. But would it not have been a piece of condescension pardonable in the Doctor, I mean, as a disputant only, if he had been pleased, instead of losing what he was going to say in a laugh, to have considered with me the passages of Scripture I had produced to clear up this material point! had he done so, the wide difference betwixt Mr. *Hutchinson* and his Defenders would have disappeared; and the *extensive idea, and diffusive exposition of the term* would have been only owing to his looking at it thro' a false medium, as children divert themselves with looking thro' a multiplying glass, and think they see as many things, as they do reflections.

“ It is made to signify, in different lights and
 “ views, *Swearers, Adjurers, Cursers, opposers,*
 “ *proposers, interposers, Allies, Covenanters, or*
 “ *Contracting Powers.* ” p. 89.

And he might have brought together twenty o-
 F 2 ther

ther phrases with as much wit and pertinency as he has done these. A variety of phrase, and difference in wording a signification is not *always* a variety in sense; and many of these words he tacks together here as a string of discordant senses, are in fact and reality the same thing. He may see now perhaps that an Oath was given and taken by a Curse; and that Covenants were confirmed by the same or like form of *execratory words*; and may recollect that אלה, as a learned man says, in contractu Fœderis (quod et אלה, *execratio*, ab adjuncto dicitur) ordinariè ponitur, and then *Allies, Covenanters* and *Contracting Powers* will be general terms, not very improperly applied to those who have bound themselves under a Curse to each other. * And abundance of this sort of drollery, which would have graced Mr. *Kalmar's* page, whence he seems to have taken the hint, better than his own, or any man's, who piques himself upon making a grave and decent *appearance*, will lose its poignancy. And if Mr. *Aboab* and Mr. *Bate* do not express themselves in the same manner, or conceive exactly alike of an Oath, what is that to our dispute? or how does that prove that the definition of *an Oath* given by

* Had the people had authority to pronounce the words of the Curse, the title of *Alcim*, would have been as proper to them as it is to kings, who had a right and authority to denounce, and on solemn occasions did denounce it; and as it is to God, who may if he pleases lay himself under the obligation of it, but whom no creature or subject had power enough to bring under its sacred band.

all mankind is not true? Why says Mr. *Kalmar*,
 “ Dr. *Sharp* betwixt them too is safe; *inter duos*
 “ *litigantes tertius gaudet*. Let then the two
 “ sanguine *H—nians* quarrel with one another,
 “ p. 12.”

The Doctor takes the hint from this scrap of Latin to rejoice in the less manly way, and slip out of the dispute, many times, where two persons differing is no proof that they are both wrong, which they must *both* be, before the *third* can be safe.

And tho' he would parallel this with the variety of senses I have charged their *Arabic* Doctors with giving to the *Hebrew* words, yet is the case by no means the same; the variety of senses the *Arabic* construction gives the word follows *necessarily* from the infinite vagueness and confusion of that language; for one man has as much right to assign any *Hebrew* word, one of the many senses, its supposed parallel *Arabic* word has, as another has to assign it another; and the same person may by the same rule and authority, construe it one way one day; and another way another; and one way in this place, and another way in that place; and differently in the same place at different times. As a learned man gives an instance of the perfection of the *Alcoranish*, called *Arabic*, and its usefulness in construing the Scriptures, because by it he could make the same *Hebrew* word in the same Text signify, *great* and *small*. Here the variety and uncertainty is unavoidable, but that betwixt Mr. *Aboab* and myself, as well as that betwixt the Doctor and Mr.
 I *Aboab*,

Aboab, and the usual variety in people's sentiments is accidental, owing only to a *moral*, not *natural*, necessity. And may admit of some of those apologies we give in answer to Infidels when they argue from the variety of Sects among Christians, and variety of opinions among those of the same Sect, against the use of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith and Manners.

Quid vetat ridentem dicere verum? and therefore the Doctor asks p. 80.

“ —If the precision appear only in Mr. *Bate's*
 “ own construction, viz. that אלה is simply a
 “ Curse ;—what is it we must say, of *the one i-*
 “ *dea* throughout, viz. *position*; by which another
 “ *H—n* determines the meaning of the word
 “ with *precision* ? ”

Why ! that the other *H—n* is mistaken : and this but a simple question ; and this and the next page but simple sneering, as perhaps he may find before he has done with the precision of *Hebrew* words. But I shall leave this sort of reasoning and treatment to the Reader's judgement, who will judge of our *manners* and *matters* for themselves without taking our directions about it. And pass on to Sect. IV. for there is nothing relating to this part of our dispute between. And here we are to consider the places where אלה is, or is supposed to be, used as a *verb*. The first is,

Joel i. 8. אלי lament.

There is no proof, saith Mr. *Hutchinson*, that this is from אלה. Dr. *Sharp* in his *Dissert.* p. 15. answers *cordially*, *very true*. It is therefore out of
 the

the present question ; for if it came from this root, it must be feminine and *singular*, when as the address is to all the inhabitants of the land, and the preceding verbs are *plural*, had this *verb*, as our Translation makes it, related to them it must have been *plural* and masculine likewise. But now the Doctor seems to have changed his mind, and claim it as a derivative of אלה,

“ and I now remark further, says he, that it may
“ refer to ארצי at ver. 6.”

But can the *accusative terram meam*, be the antecedent to the *imperative verb*? let the Reader judge of this reference upon a view of the Context. Mr. Kalmar is inclined to think that אלי is a corruption of אלו, being sensible it ought to be *plural* were it a verb, as more suitable to the context, tho' he talks of its being addressed to the nation of the *Jews collectively*, which gave the hint for referring it to *terram* in the 6th ver. I have supposed it to be a word for *sighing* or lamentation, as לל is for *crying out* or lamenting; Mar. de Cal. לל ululavit, which, as the *English* word *houl*, seems to be formed from it. And אלי, with a double ל is twice used, as, (Mar. de Cal.) *inter-jectio dolentis, væ*. And our word may be from the same root notwithstanding its dropping one ל in this place.

Here the Doctor reprimands me for saying he gave it up as a *Hebrew* word, by fetching it from the *Arabic*, which is highly resented; but unless it could come from the *Hebrew* אלה and the *Arabic* לל both, my inference holds that the *Arabic*.

rabic note contradicts the reasoning in the book itself, which I submit to the Reader ; and I could oftner divert myself with *these kind of turns*, were I to watch for opportunities.

“ He insists here, says the Doctor, upon the word
 “ *ל* being plural——.”

Which I suppose he collects, from p. 17. l. 33. and p. 18. l. 1. in both which places, I say it is in the *singular* number ; which is the ground of my reasoning, as he observes himself just above, and I never so much as hint at the contrary. This is not the *only* instance where he represents me as saying the reverse of what I do ; but I should have thought this a false print, had it not been for the absurdity he fixes upon me by this *undesigned* misrepresentation. The Doctor's Garden is full of those *flowers of Controversy* which he thinks *lose their fragrancy when they are tossed to and fro*. If he pleases therefore he may keep that to himself, which he presents me with after the above piece of ingenuity.—*I must not say that he is inconsistent with himself, for it is of a piece with the rest*. Review p. 106. and so is p. 107.

Our next Verb is, *Jud. xvii. 2.* *לית*.

“ *The eleven hundred shekels of silver, that were ta-*
 “ *ken from thee, and לית לית (Pag. tu adju-*
 “ *rasti) about which thou cursedst, and spokest*
 “ *also in mine ears——.*”

I refer this to the Curse or Bann publicly pronounced by the High Priest against all who were privy to the theft, which there was authority for in the Law, *Lev. v. 1.* and extended to all things
 taken

taken away by violence or fraud, ch. vi. 2. and incautiously said, that it might be *hiphil* here, because of the Jod in the third order; not recollecting that the *jod* is not used without an ה prefixed, unless there be some other prefix; in which case the ה is most frequently dropped. And I stand corrected for my blunder. Mr. *Kalmar* is very angry indeed about it, and I hope this will pacify him. But be it *kal* or *hiphil*, it will come to the same; and *kal* is frequently used in the *hiphil* sense. If it be in *kal*, it only says, she adjured or denounced the Curse by the Priest; as *quod facis per alium facis per te*. Why the circumstances of the times when this happened, as the Doctor argues, will not admit of my construction, doth not appear, for it is not to be imagined there was no Tabernacle or House of God in *Israel* at that time, or Priest to exercise the power God had given him. We find many places of divine worship occasionally mentioned, some one of which she might have recourse to.

The Doctor proposes several senses in his Differ. p. 16. which אלהים may bear *very consistently with the context*, but now adheres to *adjurasti*, which, says he,

“ three of my Opponents agree is not right, but
 “ disagree with each other in every thing else.”

Which if it were true, is nothing to the purpose. Nor is the sense, in our opinion, of the word at all affected by a dispute about the design, with which she uttered a Curse, for here only we differ; whether she did so in her own person, prophanely

phanelly and in a passion; or by the Priest, properly and authoritatively, as an Oath; or irregularly, herself; it comes still within the meaning of *Ale* a Curse. It was not an Oath given or taken indeed if it was only prophane Cursing; but if it was what we call *adjuring*, and spoke by herself, that was *giving an Oath* to all she suspected, and so comes within Mr. C.'s sense of *Ale*. But if the good woman did this (as we have no reason to suppose the contrary, the contrary not being said,) *regularly* by the proper Officer, here is an *Ale* which was an *Oath* to the person who spoke it, as we shall see presently, that of the Priest's was, as well as to all other persons.

After the Doctor has said all he can to rob each of his Opponents of their Exposition of some particulars in this passage of Scripture, he humbly begs leave to enjoy his own, and charitably wishes we may give each other the same liberty, which he need be in no pain about, we are not High Priests.

It is uncertain what sum of money is meant by *אלף ומאה הכסף*, whether *אלף* was a piece of money, Gold suppose, stamped with a Bull, or it be a *numeral* here, a thousand; if the first, a *Bull* or *Ox*, might be equal to a hundred of silver; but this is beside our question.

1 Sam. xiv. 24. *אל*

Saul אל adjured the People. My two Opponents, Mr. Kalmar and the Doctor, will have it, and they shall if they please, that this verb is from the root *אלה*; the first says,

“ true,

“ true, *Saul* acted rashly, but this sanguine *H—*
 “ *nian* has acted rashly too with the Scripture, not
 “ considering what is said ver. 27, 28. *charged*
 “ *the people with an Oath.*”

The second says,

“ —the sense of *adjuring* is fully confirmed by
 “ the expression in the 27th and 28th verses.”

And something more is fully confirmed in the 24th verse, if there be no doubt of the root of *שׁוּן* here, and we may rest the whole dispute upon this single Text, it being so evident that this Denunciation was *an Oath to Saul*. It gives us the form of an *Ale*, saying, *Cursed be שׁוּן he*, or *every one, that &c.* and proves that the noun, *Ale*, is rightly construed in *Deut. xxix. 12.* because *Saul* by this word, did adjure, swear, or bind under a Curse the people, and *himself* too, in the same words. God's *Ale* runs in the very form, and must likewise be a reciprocal Oath and binding to himself who spoke it.

“ Mr. *Bate*, says the Doctor, who formerly un-
 “ derstood this passage as our Translation gives it,
 “ and who is cited by me as taking it in this sense,
 “ has, in this dispute with me, changed his mind;
 “ for otherwise I should have seemed to have been
 “ in the right.”

The Doctor frequently chagrins himself with these *kind of turns*, and seems jealous of our not paying regard enough to his sentiments, which he has no reason for here; I changed my mind, not *lest he should seem to be in the right*, but because *he did seem to be in the right*.

“ Some of the best Lexicographers, says he,
 “ cite this very passage under the root לָנָה.
 “ p. 18.”

To which I reply, that *I am very much inclined to think they are in the right of it.* A piece of Complaisance I had but little reason to expect would be construed into an offence; I must not say, because it would be that sort of angry language and less candid insinuation the Doctor so often protests against, see int. al. *Review*, p. 24. that *he betrays here a visible disposition to quarrel with me how innocent soever I am*; but surely it is being too much upon the contrary, as well as captious, to suppose I changed my mind—over to his opinion, *lest he should seem to be in the right.* The Doctor very artfully adopts Mr. Kalmar's *acting rashly*, and makes it his own p. 12.; and would insinuate that I had acted *rashly with the Scripture*, as that too hasty Gentleman charges me,—in *contradicting the very evident truth, and asserting a manifest falsehood*; language which Dr. Sharp cannot be pleased with; and a charge which he cannot make out; for, saying, *Cursed be, &c.* was an adjuration; so it will be true, that *Saul* adjured the people, whatever sense לָנָה be taken in.

לֵהָאֱלֹהִים 1 Kings viii. 31.

I have the happiness to agree with Dr. Sharp, as to the sense of this word here, as referring to the Curse denounced by the High Priest—and it is no matter what part of speech it is, whether *verb* or *noun*, and shall leave to the Reader's judgement
 the

the squabble about it, *Review* p. 113. who, I imagine, will not so readily condemn me, because my words are *not so exactly* cited as they should be, at the top of the page; or because the sentence would not run so easy in *English*, if it be translated by a noun; or think I am inconsistent in translating it either as a verb or noun, when I say it may be considered as either.

Be it however *verb* or *noun* the sense is agreed upon, as referring to the *Custom of administering Oaths among the Israelites*; as Dr. *Sharp* does himself allow to my full satisfaction, *Differ.* p. 20. and which he has not retracted in his *Review*, for he there says Mr. *Bate* himself allows that this *Text* speaks of a *Curse pronounced by the High Priest*. This therefore will be one Text more for our sense of אלה, either as *verb* or *noun*, because the High Priest spoke in general terms—*He that has heard or seen or knows any thing of the matter shall bear his iniquity, if he does not utter it*, which necessarily included himself, and was as much an Oath to him as to any body else.

Hof. iv. 2. אלה and chap. x. 4. אלות.

These two passages speak of *prophane* and *false Cursing*, and *Swearing*; which is *swearing*, or denouncing Curses, as much as if it had been done in a religious and serious manner, and so the sense of the word is the same. I have the pleasure, at least I thought it so, to agree with Dr. *Sharp*, that they are *nouns* here---it may justly be doubted whether they be *verbs*, says the Doctor; to which I very complaisantly reply, *there seems to me no doubt*

doubt of their being nouns, as being convinced of it by what follows in the Dissertations. But even here I am not so happy as to give content to either of my Opponents. Mr. *Kalmar* would have me fight about it: the Doctor censures me for being *positive*.

"I thought nobody would be positive either way."

Tho' I only say, *there seems to me no doubt*; not *positive'y* there is no doubt. And I really thought it was the Doctor's opinion too that they were *nouns*, for since they must be considered either as *verbs* or *nouns*, when he said, *there may justly be made a doubt whether they be verbs or only nouns*, I concluded that he meant *there was reason to deem them nouns*, especially as he seems to design to prove them such-- what most of all, says he, *recommends the interpretation of them as nouns*, is, &c. p. 23. but I am mistaken,

"I had left it doubtful," says the Doctor.

And I do not know upon a *Review*, whether his words may not fairly be taken both ways; and he has a right to put his own interpretation upon them. But if there be any credit in being dubious here, I have no title to it. If there be any reason for doubting, it doth not appear to me, except their being pointed as verbs may be a reason. But there is an apparent reason why the Doctor should leave it doubtful, for if *אלה* *Hof.* iv. 2. be a verb, then here is one instance where the *ן* is not changed or cast away; if it be a noun, a *Swearer* or *Curser*, then it is one instance of its application to a person; and it was prudently done
to

to leave it *doubtful*, as well as to express it *doubtfully*.

The Gentlemen triumph upon an imaginary difference betwixt Mr. *Aboab* and me on this head, which if it was real, as their *manner of citing* him would make one think, would be but very little to the purpose; and the use they make of it tends only to exercise the Reader's patience, and our temper.

Mr. *Aboab* says, p. 16.

" I am much surprized that our Author, *who is*
 " *so great an advocate for the points*, should make
 " any doubt in the word חלה *Hof. iv. 2.* whe-
 " ther it is a verb." —

The Doctor relates it, as if Mr. *Aboab* was *surprized*, because it was his own opinion; whereas his *surprize* is, that an advocate for the points should make any doubt; and cites it thus,

" on the other hand, Mr. *Aboab* is even much
 " surprized I should make any doubt in the word
 " חלה." *Review*, p. 114.

Mr. *Aboab* in the next page says,

" The context requires all the words there (*viz.*
 " in *Hof. iv. 2.*) to be *construed verbally*, thus—
 " swearing, denying, murdering, stealing, *and*
 " *not as nouns.*"

The Doctor cites this,

" The context requires it to be *construed verbally*,
 " *and not as a noun,*"

and omits the word *swearing*, (for the sake of brevity only,) which explains what he meant by *construing it verbally, and not as a noun*; for the
 words

words he uses are one sort of nouns, not verbs. I am an entire stranger to Mr. *Aboab*, but imagine him a foreigner, and possibly he may not have expressed himself very accurately when he said, *verbally and not as nouns*; but his meaning is plain enough, which the *manner* of citing him, gives a quite different turn to: but the Gentlemen had good reasons for leaving out in their Citations, what the meaning of the passages turns upon; and will favour us with those reasons when called upon no doubt.

The Doctor seems mighty fond of his learned friend Mr. *Kalmar*, and follows close in his steps, tho' with a more solemn tread; and generally plays upon us in the same thought, put into more cautious language indeed.

“ Dr. *Sharp* betwixt them two is safe—let then
 “ the two sanguine *H—nians* quarrel with one
 “ another.” says Mr. *Kalmar*.

The Doctor makes us *differ whether we will or no*; thinks himself safe between us, and *appeals from one to the other*, concluding that his arguments and doubts may keep their ground till we are agreed. He is too much upon his guard to bid us *quarrel with one another*, because that would appear ill-natured; and only says, *he wishes we may not*; but hints every now and then that we have *reason to be angry with one another*.

From the *two or three* instances where *ללה* is allowed to occur as a verb, the Doctor infers what nobody ever denied, that, in *all* the above instances the *ל* being changed or cast away, it is an imperfect

perfect verb with a mutable $\aleph$: but the other part of the syllogism is not yet proved, or so much as attempted to be proved, that *imperfect* verbs always change or cast away their $\aleph$ when deflected: for if they retain the $\aleph$, one in one deflection, another may in another.

The next inference that,

“ it doth not fairly yield *that sense* in which Mr.

“ *Hutchinson* explains its derivative *Elohim*, —”

is owing to a mistake in *not knowing* in what sense Mr. *Hutchinson* explains the *radix*. And his concluding that Mr. C.’s interpretation is *dropped* by me seems to arise from not having accurately enough consider’d either that interpretation or my reasons in support of it, which he has all along turned off with an affected laugh.

What the Doctor blames me for in his 3d inference, viz. for saying that *there is but one instance where $\aleph\aleph$ occurs as a verb undoubtedly*, and that *the Doctor himself even doubts of that* I gather’d, from a view of the whole which I again appeal to; and int. al. from what he says *Differ. p. 19. that I cannot assure myself that I have even two passages to produce for the interpretation of the verb $\aleph\aleph$* ; if there be not two, there can be but one; and if the Doctor will pitch upon that one, I may have an opportunity of clearing myself further. If I have wronged him I shall be sorry for it; I do not yet see that I have. But since he chuses to talk in the dubious and oracular way, I must not be blamed for taking the words in what seems to me to be their most natural mean-

H

ing;

ing; and where I have done otherwise, if I have so done, I am contented to bear the blame.

But when he taxes Mr. *Hutchinson* with laying *so great a stress*, as he says Mr. *Hutchinson* did, and some of his followers do, on one particular sense of a verb but once used, he wrongs both Mr. *Hutchinson*, his followers, and himself too. Mr. *Hutchinson* no where lays any stress, much less *so great a stress* on its being used as a verb at all; nor do any of his followers that I know of. I have said, to clear myself of this difficulty, that I *did not care if there was not one instance of it as a verb*. And the Doctor puts himself in the wrong unnecessarily by such misrepresentations of the state of the controversy between us; and it is but seldom he cites any thing from any of us, but the reader is given to understand, that it is not agreeable to what we have said elsewhere; that we have *now* changed our minds; that we *now* allow this; soften that; and are adjusting ourselves to his commonly approved opinion, and the like; which if it shews art and conduct in a disputant, shews nothing besides but what is less becoming, and was less to be expected after his many protests in the behalf of truth and fair dealing.

We now proceed to אלה as a Noun. *Review*, p. 119.

Gen. xxiv. 41.

The word is twice used in this verse, which the LXX indifferently translate by *απα* and *ορκισμος*, as well knowing it came to the same whether you call it, Curse, or Adjuration.

The

The Doctor says he has no difference with me here, only that I think it should be render'd by *Execration*, whereas he takes Oath (I suppose he means אלה) in the sense of adjuration, which is all that is in dispute between us. And he should have shewn that an adjuration was called אלה and *απα* not, as it was a Curse denounced, but as it was denounced on others. All that I agree with the Doctor here is, that *Abraham* did not himself take an Oath. And it may be called *Abraham's Oath*, because he required it, or exacted it of his servant. So the Spies call the Oath they gave to *Rahab*, *Josh. ii. 17. her Oath*, not because she took upon her as a magistrate to administer the Oath, but because she required it of them, and they at her request ver. 12 and 14. swore unto her, *I pray you swear unto me now by the Lord*—and the men answer'd, *our life for yours if &c.* It is not said that *Abraham administered the Oath*; only ver. 3 and 37. *he made him swear*. And ver. 9. *the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his master and swore unto him*. From whence we may fairly conclude (tho' in complaisance to the Doctor I allowed it otherwise before) that the servant did himself pronounce the words of the Curse, which was the Oath. The words of the Curse are not mentioned; and tho' *Abraham* would have pronounced them, had he been to have sworn, yet as the servant only was sworn, it is not at all unlikely that he repeated the words himself; and then it is very properly expressed that he *swore unto him*; and this is as properly called,

Oath ver. 8. it being the *Oath* the servant was himself to take, at his master's request. And אלה ver. 41. which refers to this act of the servant's in *swearing* to his master, will be an *Oath properly speaking*, or a *Curse* spoke by the servant, and obligatory to himself, and so more than a *Curse denounced upon another*, which is the Doctor's definition of *Adjuration*, and his construction of אלה. Observe the wording of the Texts. — ver. 3. אשביעך *I will make or cause thee to swear*. Not *I will adjure thee*. Ver. 9. and he swore unto him; not, he was adjured by him. *Abraham* calls this, *his Oath*. His, because he required him to give it him: and *Oath*, because the servant himself gave it. The servant calls this his master's *Ale* or *Curse*. And it was his master's, and his own too. The inspired writer here as on other occasions call an *Oath* a *Curse*, and a *Curse* an *Oath*. — And אלה thus explained comes up to Mr. C.'s definition, an *Oath under a conditional malediction*. So *Abraham* and his servant conceived it. One calls it *Oath*, the other *Ale* or *Curse*. And both apprehended that a *Curse* was conditionally to affect the servant. — *Tbou shalt be clear from this my Oath*, — and 41. *this my Ale, if &c.* But says the Doctor, Differ. p. 27.

“ — it cannot signify *Oath* in any other sense than
 “ as it was *ορκισμος* an *adjuration*, or *απα* the
 “ sanction or penalty threatened.”

אלה then is a *Curse*; because *απα* is a *Curse*; and because the sanction of an *Oath* is a *Curse*. And *Oath* thus explained will do Mr. C. all the service
 he

he wants from it. I think the Doctor does here acknowledge that אלה signifies a *Curse*, or sanction of an Oath. But the drift of his argument requiring him to appropriate the word *Ale* to *Abraham* as his act, he therefore says,

“ The אלה was his who adjured, and *not* the servant's who was sworn.”

Put this into *English*, and it says, that

“ the Curse denounced, or Oath administer'd,

“ was *his* who *adjured*, (or administer'd it) and

“ not the servant's who was sworn” (or to whom it was administer'd.)

By אלה the Doctor understands, an *Oath imposed* or *administer'd*. What less does he say here now, than that *an Oath administer'd is his Oath who administers it*, and not the person's to whom it is administer'd?

This has drawn a censure upon the Doctor from an eminent writer of great candour and mildness of temper, which he would fain throw back again.

“ I am not so fortunate (says he, *Review* p. 120.)

“ to escape censure even where I had reason to hold

“ myself most secure—I had said in the Case of

“ *Abraham*, the אלה ” (put it in *English*) *the Oath administer'd*, “ was his who adjured, and

“ not the servant's who was sworn. But he gives

“ it for me, that the *Ale* between *Abraham* and

“ his servant, was the *Oath* of him who adjured

“ and imposed it, *not* the servant's who was

“ sworn.” p. 122.

And so says Dr. *Sharp*, *the Oath administer'd was*
I
his

his only who did administer it ; for he says אלה cannot be an Oath in any other sense than as it was an adjuration, which was the master's sole act ; and so it was no Oath to the servant. And according to the Doctor the Text no where says that the servant was sworn, only an adjuration was spoken by the master, which was no Oath, only the act of the speaker. The master adjures the servant, but he is not sworn, unless אלה and שבועה here signify Oath in a further sense than merely the master's act of adjuring ; which if they do, they must signify Oath or Curse, not as they are imposed on another, but as they are proper words for an Oath or Curse at large ; and then the ground of his reasoning, upon a restrained sense of Ale fails, on this score only : if they do not mean more than the act of Abraham in adjuring, then was it no Oath to the servant, and the censure above will stick where the judicious author has laid it. It is easy to see what rock the Doctor was endeavouring to avoid when he run himself upon the flats. And his Defence of himself turns wholly upon playing with אלה untranslated.

אלהו Ezek. xvii. 16. and אלתו ver. 19.

“ These passages carry an easy interpretation in
 “ the sense of Adjuration——” says the Doctor
 p. 123. But not the full sense of them, because
 ver. 13. it was for the confirmation of a Cove-
 nant,—*made a Covenant with him and brought*
him באלה (LXX) into a Curse. Covenant im-
plies conditions on both sides, and was a reci-
procal obligation. The superior in a Covenant
 pro-

pronounces the Curse in such general words as include himself.

—“ Why so? says the Doctor, this is neither
 “ said nor implied in the phrase *וְיָכַח אֶתְּוֹ בְּאֵלֶּה*. ”
 Yes it is ; if the phrase imply that he swore *Zedekiah* to the performance of the covenant he made with him : because the words of the Curse, as appears upon another greater occasion, were general, *curfed be he, that doth not keep all the words of this Covenant.* *Nebuchadnezzar* sets *Zedekiah*, who was not the right heir, tho’ of the seed royal, on the throne, and treats with him as with a king who was to pay homage to him, and whose kingdom he promised to support on that condition.—*his Oath or Curse, and his Covenant with him*, ver. 16. implies a mutual contract and reciprocal obligation ; and why should it be supposed that the king of *Babylon* should refuse to give his new ally, whom he had made a king, and set upon that respectable footing of equality, with himself, the security of an Oath, as well as of a Covenant which the Oath was a seal to? Covenants were usually confirmed by an Oath or Curse denounced against the infringer of them. Would any one now that had not a turn to serve, have asked, *why so?* why should *Nebuchadnezzar* be supposed to confirm his Covenant as other people did ?

Besides the king of *Babylon*’s Covenant and Curse, which *Zedekiah* is charged with despising ; God says ver. 19. *surely mine Oath (Curse) that he*
has

has despised, and my Covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompence upon his own head.

“ The turn (says the Doctor, p. 125.) which
 “ they aim to give this passage (for a reason that
 “ will appear presently) is this—seeing he has
 “ despised the Oath, and broken the Covenant
 “ he made with the king of *Babylon*, surely (*he*
 “ *should have said as it is in the Text*, therefore)
 “ mine אלה (Curse) *on the people in general*,
 “ which he has also despised, even it will I re-
 “ compence upon his own head.”

We do give it this turn, and so do the sacred history and the Prophets. See 2 Kings xxiv. 19. *He did evil in the sight of the Lord, 'ו' therefore thro' the anger of the Lord it came to pass, until he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah had rebelled against the king of Babylon.* And 2 Chr. xxxvi. ver. 11, 12, 13. the breach of both the Covenants are objected to him.—*He did evil in the sight of the Lord his God.—He also rebelled against king Nebuchadnezzar who had made him swear to God.—Moreover all the chief of the Priests and the people transgressed very much after the abominations of the heathens—therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees.* Here we see God punished Zedekiah and his people for rebelling against the king of *Babylon*, and himself; and made the first in the course of his Providence the immediate means of their punishment for the latter. It was Zedekiah's breaking the Covenant and despising the Curse the king of *Babylon*

Babylon had brought him under, that brought the *Chaldean* army against him, who took *Jerusalem* and burnt it with fire; carrying him and his people into captivity. How many times, and how earnestly doth *Jeremiah* argue with himself to this very purpose, chap. xxxvii. and chap. xxxviii. ver. 17. *Thus says the Lord, the God of Hosts, the God of Israel, if thou wilt assuredly go forth to the king of Babylon's princes, then thy soul shall live; and this city shall not be burnt with fire.* But he persists in his rebellion, and the city is taken and burnt, and he and the people carried away to *Babylon*; whereby the *Curse* written in the *Law* of *Moses*, was poured upon them in full vengeance. It is not therefore quite so ridiculous as the Doctor attempts to make it appear, that God should revenge his own Oath and Covenant upon *Zedekiah*, by his despising the king of *Babylon's*. And one would have thought he could not but have observed it.

God's Oath might be explained perhaps by an Oath taken in God's name; but *God's Covenant* cannot be a man's Covenant, for people covenant in their own, not God's name. And the Doctor's easy interpretation and just construction, carries something with it at first view extremely hard of digestion; but he had a turn to serve, and therefore swallows the difficulty with great ease.

But now *God's Oath* and *Covenant* carry an obvious meaning with them; and this passage a really easy construction, as implying the Oath God had sworn to them, and the Covenant he made with them when they came out of *Egypt*, their

breach of which he now revenges by the king of *Babylon*, whose anger was raised by *Zedekiah's* treachery to him. I flatter myself that I have set the Doctor's *just construction aside*; let him try and set mine aside. If he would have condescended to have looked at the 11th of *Jeremiah* which I referred the reader to, perhaps he would have saved himself the trouble of trying to establish another interpretation, as well as the chagrine of seeing it so easily *exploded*, to use his word. But then the easy passage to the explication of *Deut. xxix. 12.* had not been open'd; and the construction of that important Text must have rested, where I had placed it, on a consideration of the words of the Curse God now made use of.

Deut. xxix. 12.

“ *That thou shouldst enter into Covenant with*
 “ *the Lord thy God, and into his Oath (אלהיו)*
 “ *which the Lord thy God maketh with thee*
 “ *this day.*

This Text is produced for an אלה in the proper, and let me add, full sense of an Oath applied to God; as an incontestable proof that God did swear to the *Israelites*, as well as bind them by Oath to himself. Dr. Sharp would make it as usual an *Adjuration* only, or Oath imposed. He cites the *Christian Plan*,—*This Oath or Ale was surely, properly speaking, the Oath of God*; and says p. 129.

“ Mr. Bate is so far from understanding this Text,
 “ as the aforementioned author does of *God's Oath*
 “ properly speaking, that he interprets it as I do of
 “ an

“ an Oath administer’d by *Moses*, in God’s name.”
 p. 29. which I suppose he collects from my saying the *contrary*, in that page. I say that the ceremony of denouncing the Curse, as God’s act, was performed by *Moses*; and then after citing the Text, I say,

“ It appears here that God did engage himself as
 “ a party in the Covenant, and to perform his part
 “ under an *Alah*—Curse or Execration,”
 which was an Oath, as properly speaking, to God who spoke the words of it, as to the people, to whom he spoke them. So also p. 37.

“ When Jehovah, the ever-blessed persons of the
 “ Trinity, described in types, *all their counsel*,
 “ *the mystery of Christ, the eternal purpose, which*
 “ *he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord before the*
 “ *world began*; when this was described by *Moses*, to the Church of God, and he was in the
 “ name, and on the behalf of God, to ratify the
 “ whole by pronouncing with a loud voice,—
 “ *Cursed be he that obeyeth not the words of this*
 “ *Covenant*, God brought himself under the
 “ *Alah* he brought them, and by the same general
 “ words.”

This the Doctor *thinks* is interpreting אלה as he himself does, of an Oath administer’d by *Moses*, or of an *Adjuration* only; and in a quite different sense from the ingenious author of the *Christian Plan*; but whatever appearance my words may make in a controversial light, their plain meaning corresponds with what the elegant writer asserts; and I am sorry I must say too, that I am not so

near the sentiments of Dr. *Sharp* on this head, as he would compliment me with being. I say in the words of the first, that *the Oath or Ale was surely properly speaking the Oath of God*, and that in every sense, it could be called his Oath, whether given or taken by him. And against the latter, that tho' I do interpret it *of an Oath administer'd by Moses in God's name*, I do interpret it *of God's Oath properly*, or an Oath binding to himself; and I flatter myself I have proved it was so. But there is a little flight of hand here, which I must detect. By an *Oath administer'd* the Doctor means an *Adjuration*; but by *Moses's administering it*, or in my words *performing the Ceremony*, in God's name, I only mean that God spake by him.

“ Mr. *Bate*—interprets it, as I do—only what I
 “ call administering an Oath or adjuring, says the
 “ Doctor, he still calls, *for reasons of his own*,
 “ Cursing.”

Not for *reasons of my own*; but on the general construction of the word by the Lexicons and Translations; and the custom and manner of administering an Oath, which was by *denouncing a Curse*, conditionally. The Doctor goes on,

“ But acknowledges nevertheless that this *species*
 “ of Cursing was the method of administering an
 “ Oath (which looks as if the Doctor acknowledged it likewise.) “ and the person it was pronounced to, was *adjured* by it, and took his
 “ Oath, and *came into the Curse*, as it is called,
 “ by saying *Amen* to the Execration or Curse——

“ The

“ *The Curse, as it is called — that is called so by himself on all occasions.* ” p. 130.

Ay, and called so by the Doctor himself too, as well as by every body else. They all construe it a Curse, when it has no relation to an Oath, and often when it has; see inter al. *Num. v. 21. Neh. x. 29. enter'd into a Curse and into an Oath.* Here it is so called by every body except the author of the *Vulgate T.* who renders it *ad pollicendum.* And this and the like phrase is always render'd, as I do it in the *LXX.* It is also called so by Dr. Sharp—in his *Differ.* p. 20. *לְאַלְתָּו* is construed, *to swear him by an imprecation.* And the sense of *Adjuring* said to be near akin to that of *Cursing.* And p. 25. so near akin that *אֵלֶּה* an *Adjuration*, is a *Curse denounced* on others.—*Denunciation of judgements on &c.*—*אֵלֶּה* a *Curse* among her people. p. 28.—*the sanction of the Oath.* p. 32. *to swear thee—under a conditional Execration.* p. 33. *The form of Adjuration—to swear or wish a Curse to himself, if &c.* And p. 34. *Execrationis formula, and form of Adjuration* are understood as the very same form. p. 57. *whatever is properly called an Oath or a Curse, does so include the authority of God, and the sanction of his vengeance, as no other human action does.*

From these citations and references we may see it is not so uncommon to call an Oath a Curse. And these I trust are sufficient to justify my calling it so; as well as to clear me from the charge of calling it so, *to avoid the imputation*, as the
Doctor

Doctor says I do, of agreeing with him; I am sorry it should be an imputation to agree with him; but I called it so in the *Examiner Examined* before I knew any thing of his sentiments about it. And it appears by what I have cited from the Doctor, that I rather agree than disagree with him, a species of Cursing being, as he acknowledges, the method of administering an Oath, cited just above. I call it so, upon the usage of the word in Scripture; and the context, which obliges us in many places to see that an Oath was called אלה because a Curse denounced was an Oath. Saul, e. g. execrates the people, if saying, cursed be, was an Execration. And this is expressed by the verb אלה, as the Gentlemen will have it, and is called an Oath,

The Doctor continues to press me, p. 130.

“ —In its application to God himself—he thinks
 “ it more proper and safe to give *Alah* untrans-
 “ slated.”

The contrary of which he may see in the *Examiner Examined*, p. 19 and 21. and *Scrip. Mean.* p. 37. and if in p. 30. it is *untranslated* when applied to God; so is it when applied to other persons. If he pleases to look at p. 38. 40. 42. &c. he will see I had no mysterious design in giving it sometimes untranslated; tho’ the Doctor has in supposing so, for this is to colour over another misapprehension of what I say, and make me use a word which I have not the courage to give the true meaning to; or would use in a sense I endeavour to deprive it of. *We must separate, I say,*

say, from the word *Alah*, Execration or Curse that harshness or offensive part of the idea the word gives to the English ear; by which I intended to give the word its true and full force, as used by the *Hebrews*, whose customary way of swearing being by *cursing*, had not that *ill-will or malice*, (they are my words,) immediately and necessarily brought to their minds by it, which the word carries to our ears; whose Oaths being administer'd in a different form of words, this use of it does not attend the sound, as it did with them. To curse in *English*, is to wish a person cursed; but *Curse*, as they used it, was only conditional. And to this purpose I had explained myself several times. Mr. *Kalmar* led the Doctor the way here; but he might have seen that that learned Gentleman's thoughts were some how or other absent at that time, for where he supposes p. 15. that I mitigate the sense of *Alah*, he supposes likewise that I had said, that *Moses laid God who is superior to him under an Execration*; and charges me with some degree of impiety, in saying it; I have neither said this, nor any thing it can be fairly inferred from; and I imagine the Doctor thinks so, because he has not borrowed this, as he has done most of the other good observations of his making. Absolute Cursing, was all the harsh and offensive part that I would separate from the word. To say in those times that a person, whether *Jehovah* or *mar*, had laid themselves under an Execration could give no more offence, than saying with us, that they had bound themselves by Oath; and as a

Curse

Curse so pronounced was an Oath, (for I may be allowed to say so, till the Doctor or somebody else, shall shew that I am mistaken,) I do not think myself guilty of spiriting away the sense of the word *Execration*, or of any fault in leaving *Alah* sometimes untranslated as my betters do upon occasion, when it is *of use* to them. The use which the Doctor makes of this, p. 130, 131. is *solely* to evade the argument: which accordingly he doth not enter into; only says, p. 132. that *I only surmise but cannot prove* that God was himself *included in the Denunciation*. Tho' I produced the words of the Denunciation, that necessarily include the speaker. And from the nature of a Covenant, to which this was a seal, that they must intentionally include him: and argued from other Texts, where it is said that God did swear to him.

The Doctor cites from me in this page,

“ *That to execrate and adjure are the same thing,*
 “ why then, says he, should he not rather trans-
 “ late *אלה* when spoken of God—of *Adjura-*
 “ *tion?* ”

The reason is plain—it is not always the same thing, tho' it is in the case, *Scrip. Mean.* p. 20. the Doctor cites my words from. When spoken of God, it was an *Oath* in both senses of the word, if it has two; an *Oath* and *Adjuration* were both an *Execration*, as Dr. Sharp himself allows; but every *Execration*, any more than every *Oath*, is not an *Adjuration*. The reader may see the fallacy the Doctor's question proceeds

ceeds upon, I have pointed it out before. Mr. *Kalmar* suggested this question to the Doctor, p. 14. but seems to have made a slip in his way of putting it, “for what reason then is he pleased to render *Ex-ecration* rather than an *Oath*?” by *Oath* he seems to mean *Adjuration*; which allowing *Adjuration* to be an *Oath*; the Doctor has rectified the question.

And the Doctor’s reason, p. 128.

“Why it was not *surely properly speaking* an *Oath*,

“—*viz.* because the word is found to signify in

“SS. an *Adjuration* or *Oath* administer’d”

fails him, since this is a partial idea of the word; and it signifies in SS. also an *Oath* taken. And might be one or the other, as the terms of the *Curse* were either general or limited.

Nor does the Doctor’s supposed scripture distinction betwixt *Oath* and *Oath*, p. 136. sufficiently clear what I object to *Scrip. Mean.* p. 102. as the note, *Review*, p. 137. would have it thought, because *an Oath made with them* is a joint act, and signifies more than *an Oath imposed upon them*. And my charge remains in full force, that the Doctor unwittingly gives up his own distinction and argument through an over-eagerness, more common to mere disputants, to catch a man at his word, rather than his meaning. Mr. C. is arguing against Mr. *Bd.* who acknowledged that *Alah* was properly an *Oath* (tho’ the Doctor to shew there is the same uniformity of sentiments betwixt Mr. *Hutchinson*’s Opposers as his Defenders, denies it.) but asserted it was called *God’s*,
K because

because he ordered the *Israelites* to take it, many days after, *Exam.* p. 14. and produces this Text, *God's Oath and he made it this day.* Now leave out the word *made*, and Mr. C.'s reply stands as good as before, that *it was God's Oath with them that day*: so that Mr. C. lays no stress on the proper signification of כרת render'd *made*, which is what the Doctor would catch him tripping at. But if *made with them* refer to Oath or Alah, and not to Covenant only, then was this more than an Oath imposed: and was his Oath or *Alah* as well as theirs.

As the Doctor's distinction between אלה and נשבע (an Oath taken by the verb נשבע being denominated from the noun אלה) is not such as he had taken it to be, there will be no occasion to find some instance of a previous Oath of God called אלה in SS. This verb נשבע by which God's swearing to the Patriarchs, and to their children when they came out of *Egypt*, and to the very people *Moses* in this Text (*Deut.* xxix. 12.) is speaking to, is exprest, being the usual correlative to the noun *Alah*: for a reason that I hope now appears in the radical meaning of the words. If an Oath were a Curse, and *Ale* be a proper word for a Curse, then an Oath was an *Ale* whether called so or no, and will be the more expressive word, as saying what an Oath was, which the other word doth not.

The Covenant, which this Execration against the infringer of it was to confirm, was what God had made with *Abraham*.—*I will make of thee a great nation—and I will bless them that bless thee,*

thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed. Here is an Execration denounced against all that should prove enemies to *Abraham*. And under the shelter of this Execration does God admit the children of *Abraham*, by a formal repetition of it, and of all the particulars, it was a seal to, at large; now that the *time of the promise* was come—to be *exemplified* in the outward letter. The Covenant at *Horeb* or in the wilderness promises nothing but what God had promised in *Abraham*; and promises all that was then promised to the Church of God or Seed of *Abraham*. Here is nothing new promised; and if on man's side, it may be called another Covenant, because made with people not in being, otherwise than as they were in the loins of *Abraham*; yet on God's side is it the same Covenant, and the same Oath, *repeated:—as he has sworn unto thy fathers, viz. to bless those that blessed them, and curse those that cursed them.* And this God now repeats to the children, in numberless places in this book of *Deuteronomy*, as the substance of what he swore to their Fathers. And this must necessarily lead our thoughts to that Covenant, and the spiritual promises then made by it of a blessing from that Great Seed of *Abraham*, who was the desire of all nations. *After the same manner, or to the same purport, he had sworn to their fathers,—to establish his Covenant, which he swore unto their fathers.—*“ No; says the Doctor, it is only said—*if they would obediently come into his terms, then he would perform*
K 2 “ what

“ what he had sworn to *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* concerning them. ”

What is the *No* for then ? If the Covenant God here admits them into were what he had sworn to their fathers; then he admits them into a Covenant to which his Oath was annexed ; and so into his Covenant and his Oath—which was in a word, to *all the* benefits promised in Christ.

“ No ; replies the Doctor again, they were to

“ enter into an *אֱלֹהִים* made with them that day. ”

p. 134. No doubt it was in one sense made that day ; but it was made to *Abraham* before that day also. And an Oath was sworn by God to them on that day, or at this time in the wilderness, as before cited, and under another phrase, *Ezek. xx. 28. I brought them into the land for which I lifted up mine hand to give it them.* When was there any Oath of God, made with them about their going into *Canaan*, but what was made at making the Covenant at *Horeb* with this very people, or at the renewal of it in the land of *Moab*, to which *Moses* does here refer ? The *אֱלֹהִים* into which *the people enter'd*, could not contain, the Doctor answers, *the conditions on God's part, which belonged to a former Oath of his own.* But God could repeat that former Oath, and swear the people to his Covenant, and this was bringing them into Oath with himself. By the same way of arguing that the Doctor would prove the Oath was not of God's own making, you might prove too that the Covenant was not of God's making. *The Covenant into which the people*

I

ple

ple entered could not contain the conditions on God's part which belonged to a former Covenant of his own, and were to be fulfilled by him. And therefore he did not covenant *with* the people or swear *with* them as the Text says, but they only covenanted *to* him, and swore *to* him.

“ What is there (says the Doctor in arguing against the Rev. the Provost of *Oriel*) in the Text or in the Context, to lead our thoughts from the transaction then in hand, to the original Covenant ? ”

Every word of the Text and of the Context leads our thoughts thither. This Covenant was not of an earthly nature, *only*. It directs their eyes to God their heavenly Father, teaching them to look upon themselves as his children ; as a people holy to Jehovah. God calling himself their God promised them a Resurrection from the dead. This was the Gospel which was preached before to *Abraham*. *The Redemption of his people, as he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been since the world began.* And so says Bp. Bull, *Lex spiritualiter considerata erat ipsissimum Evangelium.* *It was the bringing in of the better hope. The shadow of the good things to come.* And this Covenant with them was seen and understood by them in that view. *Thro' faith they kept the Passover and the sprinkling of the blood.* If this Covenant and Oath was that they should be God's people and he a God to them, all was promised to them in these expressions that is promised in the whole Scriptures ; and as they had faith and
common

common sense, they must see the meaning of the words. And therefore their thoughts were naturally led from that to the original Covenant for the redemption of the Faithful, which God now swore to give them a pledge, an assurance of; and to exemplify it in them by giving them a perpetual abiding place, and destroying all enemies from before them. We make brutes of them in thinking they did not see the design of God in that Dispensation to them, and the whole Scripture leads our thoughts from that to the original Covenant of God; or from what God now covenants to give them, to what he originally covenanted to give to all the children of the Faith of *Abraham*. It is the catholick Faith that the Law was the Gospel described by Types and Ceremonies: and that *tho' they were not named Christian Men yet was it a Christian Faith which they had; for they looked for all the benefits of God the father thro' the merits of his son Jesus Christ.* And therefore we may very safely say, that not only the words of this Text, but the whole Context, and every Type and every Ceremony in the Law, to the performance of which God now swears himself and them, led their thoughts from this to the original Covenant of which this could be but a repetition, as being now but shadowed out in their redemption and the inheritance they were going to take possession of. If the things promised them at this time, and the Types now instituted, were only for the sake of the thing signified, in comparison of which they were nothing,
and

and are spoke of as if they were not *even* included in the promise, then had they reason to conclude that this Covenant or this transaction, was but a figure of the original. It is said that God swore to give *Abaham* the land of *Canaan*, *Deut.* xxx. 20. but he gave him none inheritance in it; and *St. Paul*, *Heb.* xi. 39. says, of many that had an inheritance in *Canaan*, that they died, not having received the promise: what is true of Circumcision, is true of the whole Law, that was not the Law which was outward. The conclusion then is that if this were but a *repetition* of the original Covenant in Type, the Oath was a repetition of an original Oath also.

I have all along made use of the word *Covenant* for *Berith*, in these Texts, and not Purifier or Purification, with a design, the Doctor charges me, p. 142. to gain an advantage to my construction of *אלה*, that I may make God a party in the Curse with his people; I suppose he means as well as in the Covenant, or as the nature of a Covenant requires. And were they not parties in a Covenant? and were not the words of the *Purification-Sacrifice*, or articles on which its blood was shed, conditions on both sides? Whether *Berith* be render'd *Purification*, or *Covenant*, Articles of Agreement are supposed to have been settled between the parties who passed between the parts of the Sacrifice. The Sacrifice and sprinkling of the blood, whence the propriety of this Etymology of *Berith*, we think appears, were the grand Ceremonies at making a Covenant.

nant. And the argument about the Curse denounced against the infringer of those Articles neither gets nor loses any advantage by the Translation; unless you will say the people did not enter into Covenant with God. We labour under the same difficulty here, the want of a proper familiar phrase, we do in *Aleim*, which will express the literal sense, and preserve its customary application.

And in this unrestrained sense, as an Oath in general is אלה used in the two next Texts, considered by the Doctor. The first is

Lev. v. 1.

“ If a man shall bear the voice of Swearing
 “ אלה, and be a witness, or hath seen or known
 “ of it, if he do not utter it, he shall bear his
 “ iniquity.”

The Doctor agrees with me that this אלה was spoke by the High Priest; only I would have this, he says, and the parallel passages, render'd by *Cursing*, whereas he would have it by *Adjuration*. And does not *Alah* signify a *Curse*; and was not an *Adjuration* a *Curse* denounced? If so, he is here arguing upon a distinction without a difference. If not, he should have condescended to have shewn where the difference lay. But this *Adjuration* of the Priest must include himself, as well as others; for suppose him to be a witness, or to have seen or known any thing about which it was denounced, was he not bound by the same obligation as others to utter it? or else to bear his iniquity. The Priest says, *he that knows and doth*
 not

not speak shall bear his iniquity. If this was an *Adjuration* it affected the speaker as much as any other person. But *Adjuration* or אלה so explained will do the Doctor no service. And for this reason *Adjuration* is not preferable to *Swearing*, or *Oath*, as in the Text of our Bible, in the margin of *Pagnin*; and in the *Vulgate*; or than *Curse*, as in the *LXX*, in the parallel places, in *Kings* and *Chron.*

Gen. xxvi. 28.

“ *Let there be now an Alah betwixt us—and*

“ *they swear one to another.*”

All the Translations are against the Doctor here, for all of them render it *Oath*; except *LXX*, who render it by *Curse*. And it appears at first view to be rightly translated; *Oath*, because *they swear to each other*. And *Curse*; because an *Oath* was a *Curse*. And the noun אלה stands here, as the *Correlative*, as it does in other places, to the verb בשבע. But it must not signify *Oath* or *Curse*, tho' it was *betwixt them*, a mutual act, obligatory on both parties; and tho' it is expressly said, they did in consequence of this proposal, *swear to each other*, properly speaking; for *Abimelech* might intend only to impose an *Oath* upon *Isaac*, as *being a King*, and *his superior in character of life*; without condescending to give his *Oath* to him, tho' he is so submissive as to propose a *Covenant* between them, which seems as derogatory to his Majesty as *Swearing* can be, *Abimelech* however doth not design to swear, and therefore when he says *let there be an Oath betwixt us*, he

L

only

only means, *let me swear you to our Covenant.* But *Isaac* who is as cunning as *Abimelech*, and had not the best opinion of his honesty, does not relish this suspicious proposal, but insists on an Oath from the other side, which accounts for the use of שבע ver. 31. and makes *Alah* an *Adjuration* only, in the 28th. See *Differ.* p. 32. But if all this may be supposed (as what may not be supposed when one has a mind to it, that is not impossible?) yet it amounts to no more than a groundless supposition. For the Text says nothing, nor gives you any hint of this unreasonable and inconsistent design of *Abimelech*; or of *Isaac's* insisting upon an Oath likewise; but only that he consents to the proposal of an Oath and Covenant between them, entertains them at a feast, and the next day as proposed they swear to each other.

In the *Review* p. 147. there is mention of authorities produced in the *Differ.* p. 31—34. for *Adjuration*. I see none but the *Samaritan*, *juramentum maledictione*; the *Greek* ἀρα, *Curse*. And *Lud de Dieu's* *Execratio*. There is talk indeed of the most antient versions, but none produced, but what directly contradict what they are produced for.

This supposition being set aside, till it be reconciled to the Text, and something brought to support it, The next thing is,

“ That Oaths, in those times were administer'd by
“ *Adjuration.* ”

What are we to understand by these words? not that all Oaths were administer'd, whatever administering

nistring them by Adjuration, may mean; for many Oaths were taken by persons themselves. When God swore, the Oath was not administer'd to him; and so in many other instances; *an Oath in its proper sense as the act of the person who swears being the usual and most proper meaning of שביעה*, the word so often used for an Oath, see *Differ.* p. 24. And *Adjuration* is the act of him who adjures, and not of the person who is sworn. We cannot say then, that Oaths, properly speaking, but only that some Oaths were administer'd to or imposed upon people in those times; which is true also of these times. If you do not limit the words, but say, that *all Oaths were administer'd by Adjuration*, then besides contradicting of facts, God's *Ale* may be his Oath in its proper sense, all Oaths being Adjurations. Which gives up all that is contended for through a great part of the *Differ.* and *Review*. We must rectify the proposition then and say,

“ that some Oaths were administer'd by Adjuration.”

—Administer'd by *Adjuration*. Here again we are at a loss; for *adjuring* and *administring an Oath*, are all along used as synonymous terms, see *Differ.* p. 12. and *Review* p. 129. cited below. Taking Adjuration in this sense, *that Oaths in those times were administer'd by administring*, is true, but an observation of no service to himself or any body else. But *Differ.* p. 25. *an Adjuration is a Curse denounced upon another*. And I should have thought that the Doctor had meant,

“ That some Oaths in those times were administer'd

“ by denouncing a Curse, on the persons who
 “ were sworn.”

Which is sense and truth; but then as all Oaths were not made by a Curse denounced by others, but in many instances by a Curse, (expressed or sufficiently implied) on themselves, this sense of the words can be of no use to him where he employs them (p. 32.) to prove that the *Ale* betwixt *Abimelech* and *Isaac* was an Adjuration, and not an Oath, as the own act of either of them; for *that* might be one of those Oaths that were not administer'd by Adjuration, notwithstanding that some were so administer'd.

Beside the Doctor distinguishes betwixt *Execration* and *Adjuration*, Review p. 120.—*Execration. Whereas I take Oath in the sense of Adjuration.* And p. 129. “ only what I call administering an Oath or adjuring, he still calls, for reasons of his own, *Cursing*,” or denouncing a Curse on them. Adjuration, we see is not, *now*, denouncing a Curse, but something else. What the something else is, we may learn perhaps from what follows the words under consideration, *Differ.* P. 33.

“ The antient form of Adjuration is to be understood, as if *Jacob* was enjoined (*Gen.* xxxi. 49.) to swear or wish a Curse to himself, if, &c.”

We see the idea of *Adjuration* is now become very extensive, and the exposition of the term very diffusive, and so comprehensive as to take in direct contraries. It is made to signify in different lights and views, *An Oath administer'd to another, not*

taken by one's self. A command to swear one's self. A Curse denounced on others, not on one's self. An injunction to wish a Curse to one's self; but not an Execration or Cursing, whether denounced or wished, on one's self or others. So unsettled is the Doctor in his own meaning of his principal word; and opposite to himself.

It is to be observed that the Doctor speaks very cautiously, and with some seeming hesitation, when he comes to describe the *antient form of Adjuration*—as if Jacob was enjoined to swear or wish a Curse to himself. If we are to understand this as if he were bid to do it without its being intended that he should do it, then here was no Oath either given or taken by this form; for *Laban* who is supposed to adjure *Jacob*, only speaks as if he bid him adjure himself, and does not do it with his own mouth. And if *Jacob* did swear or wish a Curse to himself, then *Adjuration* and *Oath* are both of them the act of the person who is sworn. And this increases the number of senses in which the Doctor uses the word *Adjuration*; and gives up his own restrained sense of אלה; for he does here allow that according to the *antient form of Adjuration*, *Isaac* did, tho' at the request of *Abimelech*, swear or wish a Curse to himself, which are once more become the same thing. And all that I have been contending for, viz. that אלה is a Curse or Oath, whether the words of it are spoken by the person himself, who is sworn; or by another, is yielded, in the fullest manner I can desire. But if there be *this great variance*

ance about the proper signification of an English word, (and a word of the greatest consequence in his *Disquisition*) betwixt Dr. Sharp and himself, it will surcease I hope the wonder, as well as abate of the pleasure, he seems to take, at Mr. *Aboab's* and my thinking differently about the idea of a Hebrew one; and he would do well to consider seriously with himself, for it is not a matter he will readily laugh at, what a variety of senses the most learned of the Anti-H——nians gives his own words. And the Reader won't think we have been losing time, whilst we have been considering the words of the wise, and his dark sayings; and may learn from hence that where Dr. Sharp talks in the less consistent and less conspicuous way, it is because he can't avoid it, or otherwise get rid of a plain Text that contradicts all he has been maintaining: for it must be confest, at first view, that there seems no exception against interpreting *Ale* in this place simply of an Oath, *juramentum*, considered as taken freely and voluntarily.—Let there be an Oath betwixt us, and let us make a Covenant with thee—and they swear one to another.

And the Doctor does once more yield the point, *Review*, p. 149. “Mr. Bate renders אלה by *Curse*, “but he so softens the term,—” (he uses the word *Curse*, and he cou'd not use a harsher one.) “——as to resolve it into my construction, viz. a reciprocal Adjuration——as if each “had said, *Cursed be he that keepeth not the words “of this Covenant*, and so each included himself.”
——A reciprocal Adjuration, in which each person

son adjured, or wished the Curse to himself; and such the *Curse* betwixt them was. Each swore to the other, or each pronounced the words of the Curse, as the Doctor allows. Each said, *Cursed be he that* &c. and whom were these words binding to? why only to the speaker of them. Neither of them had any jurisdiction over the other. Nor can any person have power to bind another in a Covenant or by Oath, whether he will or no; unless it be in *some* cases where the Laws of God or man give them the power; *Abimelech* had no such power over *Isaac*, and therefore when he said, *Cursed be he that keepeth not the words of this Covenant*, he bound or swore himself, but not *Isaac*; and *Isaac* by pronouncing those words bound himself, and not *Abimelech*. And if this be what the Doctor means by a *reciprocal Adjuration*, he is come into my construction, and what I at first set out with; and departed entirely from his own, and uses the word *Adjuration* in a sense nobody else does; nor he himself did, till now that he is driven to it by the force of truth, being resolved to keep the *term*, tho' he give up *the meaning* in contest; for such a *reciprocal Adjuration* is a *reciprocal Oath*, or Oath given by each of them to the other.

But the Doctor was mistaken in his *word*, when he said, that I *soften the term*; he meant *the manner*, which was by using *general words*, and so avoiding the disagreeable application of a *Curse immediately* to themselves, as saying, *Cursed may I be, if, &c.* is: tho' what they said was virtually
the

the same. And God makes the like distant application when he swears, which kept up the reverence due to himself, and avoided the supposition of any likelihood that he could incur the penalty. But where there was any suspicion of Guilt, or probability of falsifying the Oath, as God foresaw the *Israelites* would, some of them do, he dwells upon the words of the Curse, and applies them over and over again to them to strike the greater terror and awe upon their minds. And as the design of his Curse required, this being a league offensive and defensive, tells them that if they *obeyed* his voice, he would put the Curse upon their enemies.

But what I meant, where the Doctor will have it that I *soften the term*, tho' it is nothing to the dispute, is plain enough; yet I am in doubt which of those great men, *denounced the Curse*; it being an act of superiority to administer an Oath, and therefore I say possibly each might denounce it for himself, and so each swear himself. The Doctor does allow that each did denounce the words for himself, and if that was not each giving his own Oath, and so *אלה* *an Oath properly speaking*, I must be excused for thinking so, till the contrary is shewn, since it appears so plain; and being the Doctor's own definition of *an Oath*, (*an Imprecation of evil on one's self*) till that is retracted, I can't help thinking this part of our dispute to be at last settled. I was in hopes indeed that on the winding up of the matter we should agree; and had ventured to say,
that

that the Scripture definition of an Oath, would be decisive.

I have gone thro' the consideration of *Ale* as a noun, and, from what has been said, we see that Dr. *Sharp* was not so well apprized of Mr. *Hutchinson's* and Mr. C.'s sense of *Ale*, as might have been expected: nor of the Scripture definition of an Oath: nor of his own meaning in the use of his principal word, *Adjuration*, which was least of all to have been expected.

2. That he who denounced the words of a Curse, in general terms, did bind, or swear himself. Which clears Mr. C.'s construction of *Ale*.

3. That Dr. *Sharp* can trifle as well as other people: it being no objection to the truth of Mr. *Hutchinson's* definition, that every body doth not agree with him in it.

I have said, and I hope I may repeat it now, that *Ale* construed, a Curse, and a Curse considered as an Oath, as in fact it was, when denounced conditionally, will clear up the objections and mistakes that have arisen about *Aleim* and *Alue*. In this view the dispute against Mr. C. from the supposed difference betwixt a Curse and an Oath, and betwixt *Oath* and *Adjuration*, falls at once.

There is nothing plainer in Scripture than the form of an Oath, *they swore saying, Cursed be*. This is properly called a Curse, in Hebrew אָלָה; and the *Agent* in that language is expressed by the same letters or word, the *action performed is*; this is well known, nor is it denied. God did de-

M

nounce

nounce a *Curse*, therefore was the Agent, the *Denouncer*; and *bound* by his own Denunciation, in our language, *sworn*. And tho' objections have been raised from our rendering *Aleim* persons *sworn*, and yet making it a *noun* or *participle*, *active*; yet is this *Denunciation*, of which God was the speaker, a proof that *he was sworn*, and that he was *actively Aleim*; and not *passively, Alueim*, as the *Jews*, for a plain reason, have *pointed* it. In the *active sense*, it is *one that has sworn*; in the *passive*, it is *accursed*. I am loth to call it cavilling about what words, but what is plainer than that he who *pronounced the Curse*, was a *swearer*; as well as *sworn*, tho' not *accursed*? *Aleim*, supposing it a *Hebrew* word, because as old as *Adam*; and to signify in one part of speech, (mut. mut.) what it does in another, because the language was formed by God, cannot be *passive*, because he who denounced the *Curse*, was only *sworn*, not *execrated*. And he who was *execrated*, was not *sworn*; for *being sworn*, means only being *conditionally bound*, and it is playing with the *English* words here that has bred the confusion, which attending to the radical meaning of *Ale*, and the manner of *swearing*, removes immediately.

If we are right in the construction of *Ale*, an *Imprecation*, and *Aleim* *Imprecators*, it follows that none but God and his Vicegerents, those who had authority and commission to act in his name, could be properly called *Aleim*. It would have been a prophanation in vulgar mouths, as well as an utter impropriety for any to have denounced
that

that Curse or Bann, which they had no power to inflict, if incurred; or authority to enquire into the contempt of. Which accounts for appropriating the title to God, and the chief magistrates. And tho' any who *denounced the Curse*, were strictly speaking *Aleim*; yet those only were called so, who had full power and authority in themselves to execute the magisterial act. And this word as well as its *passive Alue* seems separated like *ecclesiastical* words or divinity terms, among all nations, from common use, tho' not from their proper meanings.

If all the three Persons in Jehovah did jointly denounce the Curse; they must be denominated from that act; not from one of them being made a Curse. And they did all three join, because they all three *swore*, (for swearing was by pronouncing a Curse) to perform what they promised in Christ.

The words of the *Imprecation* Jehovah takes this name from, and the occasion of it, shews that the Oath was not for *their own* satisfaction, to give each other security for the performance of their parts in the Covenant of Grace, but to give the heirs of the promise the strongest confirmation of the immutability of their council. The absurdity of making the three divine Persons *swear to each other*, was first father'd upon Mr. C. by Mr. Bd. who thro' haste and spleen run away with it as he did with several others. Mr. *Hutchinson* and Mr. C. have said no such thing; nor does what they do say, imply any such thing. Mr. *Hutchinson*
M 2 explains

explains himself vol. 6. Edit. *Hod.* p. 332. that the Oath, tho' taken by them, was taken for our sakes not their own; that Jehovah was called *A-leim*, as Kings are, from covenanting and swearing to deliver their subjects. Which according to the strict *Hebrew* phrase, is *denouncing a Curse against all their enemies*. This false representation of the matter is rectified at large by the *Examiner Examined*, p. 11. and the author called upon to give his reasons for putting it upon us. And yet the *Modest Apology*, a performance that shames fair reasoning and fair dealing both, repeats the same false and ridiculous charge, p. 51.

“ Can any reason be assigned, why the three divine persons, should either give or exact an Oath of one another? no, it is an impious supposition.”

This *impious supposition*, is returned back to the author, in the *Answer to the M. Apology*, and the charge formally confuted a *third* time in print, p. 103. Would any one think we should be charged after this with the same impious supposition? yes, the Rev. Dr. *Sharp*, *Dissert.* p. 42, 43. repeats and enlarges upon it; and gravely sets forth the folly of it. And p. 66. repeats it again; and with great vehemence presses the impiety upon us. Mr. *Aboab* disowns the charge, p. 25. and I have disproved it again, *Script. Mean.* p. 48. The Doctor takes no notice of all this, but *Review*, p. 86. says, this was the dispute with Mr. C. instead of saying, it was a groundless charge of his against Mr. C. and p. 156. he repeats

peats it again, as if they had said or hinted at any such thing. He took the slander, for a slander it is, and a gross one, against us, from the *M. Apology*, as one may guess by the turn of his expression, and cannot plead the same excuse that author may, of not knowing whether it was true or false, because the Doctor has the several pamphlets by him, and says he has read them, where this injurious treatment was *formerly* so often complained of; and undertakes to confute the later ones where these complaints are repeated a fourth and fifth time. This confident assertion of the Doctor's in his *Dissert.* I suppose misled Mr. *Kalmar*, to charge me, p. 22. with explaining, "Elohim (he should have said *Aleim*, but they can't get it out of their heads, but that they are the same word) swearers to a Covenant, and "that to one another."

Mr. *Kalmar* is very excusable, as he might naturally think, Dr. *Sharp* was to be trusted in such a thing as this, the relation of a plain matter of fact. And I wish such behaviour may not make some people suspect the sincerity of the many protestations of candour and open dealing the good Doctor sets forth with, and think it argues a criminal prejudice, and too strong a disgust to admit of an impartial examination of the cause litigated between us. But this is a part of the controversy, I imagine not more agreeable to the Reader than it is to me. It grieves me to have occasion to complain, but people, who have been so often assured to the contrary, may see by this, among

among *other* instances, that we have but too much ground for those complaints, our Adversaries raise a vast cry and accusation against us from ; and take occasion to read us the most pathetic lectures of meekness, humility and patience ; professing with the counterfeit Priest, in *Shakespear*,

“ to call us by the most modest terms ; for they
 “ are of those gentle ones, that will use the Devil
 “ himself with curtesie. ”

This word, (*Aleim*) as a name of God, says there is a plurality of Persons in Jehovah, and that they have denounced a Curse, Imprecation or Bann ; but expresses not of what nature, *to* whom or *a-*
gainst whom, nor on what occasion it was pronounced. It only supposes some Covenant, Law, Edict or Commands given forth, and the observance of them enforced under that penalty. But tho' the word do not itself tell us what those terms of Grace were, whose ratification was sealed by its denunciation, the Scriptures do, and explain all this at large. We know what God's Curse implied when we find it annexed to the contempt of the Law, and denounced to enforce its observance ; because the *Law* was the *Covenant of God in Christ* (*Eph. i. 4.*) *πρὸ τῆς κατεβολῆς*, *before the foundation of the world.* Jehovah foresaw the enmity and treachery of the fallen Angels, which they have ever since the creation of man exercised against man, and resolving to defeat it, enter'd into measures to turn the Curse, which Satan meditated to bring on man, back upon himself, and all those who should not join in, or oppose those
 measures,

measures, *saying, Cursed be every one who doth not observe them*; which was making himself Parties, Allies, Confederates, with the true Believer against Satan, and all other his enemies, such a Denunciation reflecting back an obligation upon the speaker of it, as well as binding those it was spoke to, or upon whose account it was spoke, tho' not then in being; whose consent, any more than their *then* actually existence, was not necessary to render it valid. And the publick declaration of it before the creation of man may be deemed a merciful warning even to the Tempter himself; whose malice was as yet, if hatched in the mind, not brought forth into act.

Ale being a Curse, and the personal noun, *one sworn*, because he *was sworn* by being the *pronouncer* of a Curse, *Alue*, according to rule will be *one made a Curse*, one who is a Curse. And it comes to the same whether you call the word, a *participle*, or *noun*; only it must be observed that the grammar distinctions, which later ages have invented, as serving to bring in some measure later languages under a kind of rule, will not hold in *Hebrew*. And of all the languages since invented, the *Greek* and *Latin* and their derivatives, are the least suitable to the *Hebrew* tongue, the geniuses of the languages being so widely different. Notwithstanding that they had a greater regard to the structure of the *Hebrew* language, in the first formation of theirs, than at first sight one would have thought, as that learned and ingenious Linguist Dr. *Gregory Sharp* has so surprisngly shewn
in

in his instructive Treatise, *viz.* his Dissertations on the *Hebrew* and *Latin* Tongues. And the rules laid down by the *Apostates* are most justly to be suspected, and most carefully to be avoided, *lest we be snared therein, for they are an abomination to the Lord our God.* The Curse is upon them. Their Traditions made the word of God of none effect above seventeen hundred years ago, and they have been increasing in ignorance, and malice against God and his Christ, ever since. Christians may rest assured that God would never leave us to the mercy of these men, for our knowledge in his word. The natural rules of the tongue are in the language itself, and may there be found, by a proper application. And whatever pains it may cost us, or whatever opposition it may meet with from those who have been otherwise educated, it is in the Bible itself, and in the Bible only we are to look for them. And in so doing we may justly expect the blessing of God upon our labours.

Jehovah in man was made a Curse for us; and as *Alue* is often used in the singular number, (*never* in the *plural*;) as a name of God, we say, and one would think not without reason, that it denotes that person only who took the Curse, the *Ale* of the Law (for אלה is used for the Curse of the Law, as well as קללה) upon him, in our stead. The *Jews* disown a suffering Messiah, and the Devil *wisely* instigated them to put him to death, lest he should be the person whom God had appointed to die for mankind; and they oppose

pose him and us now, because we preach the same doctrine, and would, as we are directed to do, prove from the *Hebrew* that *he was the Curse*. אלוה by the natural rules of *Hebrew* is a *passive*, whether you call it *noun*, *participle* or *adjective*, many other words being formed in the like manner; tho' many others, and perhaps more, are otherwise terminated in ך, in the *passive*, of what they call *Pabul*; but we have instances enough of words terminated in ך when they stand by themselves, absolutely, as *passive* nouns, as this does.

As this stupendous mystery, a suffering Messiah, is a Miracle of Mercy and Condescension God upbraids his people with forsaking. “ *The Person the Execration who made them, and apostatizing from the Strength their Saviour*. Deut. xxxiv. 15. and challenges against their false Gods, *Isai.* xlv. 8. and *Psal.* xviii. 32. *who is there made a Curse besides me*. Which of your Gods are engaged to bear the Curse for you? A most noble challenge, and of the highest consequence to them, since all their happiness in the next world, depended upon Jehovah's bearing this Curse for them; and on their knowing and believing it. Here the *points* had truly speaking plaid the Devil with us, and by making *Aleim* a *passive* likewise, confounded the meaning of both words so far that Christians were afraid to apply them to God in their otherwise natural and obvious sense. Mr. *Bd.* threw a grammatical rub in the way of this construction of *Alue*, as he did in that of our construction of *Aleim*, which Dr. *Sharp* has taken

N en

en up, and new pointed ; both which I wave for the present, till other objections of a different nature, and which seem first to *deserve* our thoughts, have had their due consideration. For if the sense can't be made to comport, and the etymology to speak the great Truths of Christianity, we need not trouble ourselves about objections founded on grammatical terms ; and on the other side, if these Titles fairly appear to point out that relation God and man stand in to each other by the Covenant of Grace ; and the surprising condescension of one of those ever-blessed Persons in becoming our surety, and bearing the weight of divine justice for us, then we shall come with less biassed minds to inquire into the grammar difficulties which were raised by the enemies of the Cross, and owe their bulk and size, to the mist of rabinical evasions, they have been so long seen through : and be the easier induced to think it more becoming of Christians to endeavour to dispel, instead of thickning, that mist ; and let in the light upon those who do not yet see that Christ *was to die* for them, instead of darkning the sight of those who do. And here it was to be expected that some would take offence, but *if we would be sons of the truth, we must consider what it speaketh, and trample upon our own credit, yea, and upon other men's too, if either be any way an hindrance to it.*

And I proceed now to Sect. 8. *Review*, p. 193. setting what relates to grammar all together at the end ; that the Reader may look at it first or last,

last, as he pleases; I put it last, as of the least consequence and weight against us.

“ Their application of אֱלֹהִים to Christ as his peculiar title——doth not correspond with *their own* construction of אֱלֹהִים——and I gave my reasons, says the Doctor, from p. 45. to p. 51.”

And I consider'd those reasons, and shewed that his objections arose from not rightly apprehending what was their construction of אֱלֹהִים; and the repetition of the same objections here may perhaps be owing to his not caring to look at that construction as I had enlarged upon it, and applied to the removing of them.

“ If *Alab* the verb, signifies to swear, (says he, p. 194, 195.) “ or bind one's self under a conditional Execration, the *participle passive* will signify *sworn*, or bound under a conditional Execration; and consequently will not signify *execrated*: without departing from the given construction of *Alab*: for it cannot signify being under an *actual* Execration, if it signify being under a *conditional one*”——If it be true as they assert, that each Person in the Trinity was sworn——each Person will be אֱלֹהִים. Each Person, says Mr. Bate, was bound by a Curse. p. 37.—And why is not every man אֱלֹהִים as being——bound under the Curse?——This Mr. Bate would avoid by saying that אֱלֹהִים is not applicable to men, but only to the *pronouncers of the Curse*, to those to whom supreme power belongeth. Consequently no man can be אֱלֹהִים but the God-man. p. 83. and 43.”

Whether I have avoided or answer'd the Doctor's objections, the Reader by turning to the places referred to, will soon see the necessity of reading me in my own words, if he would know what I have said, or how I have stated my answers. The objections are pretty well cleared I hope under the last head where we consider'd the sense of *Ale*, and manner of making what we call an Oath. And had the Doctor defined *an Oath* according to the *antient form*, I imagine he would not have started them, much less have repeated them after a *review*. *Ale* signifies *Oath*, as a Curse was the tye upon the mind of him who had consented to be cursed, if he falsified. To be *bound by a Curse*, or to be under or brought into a Curse, is being under that tye; but he who consents to become liable to a Curse, *upon conditions unperformed*, is not cursed. To curse or denounce a Curse, may be declaring a person *cursed*, either *absolutely* or *conditionally*; but neither of these *adverbs* are included in the sense of the *verb*; for they regard only the *design* with which the Curse is declared. God says to the Serpent, *Gen. iii. 14.* "because thou hast done this אַתָּה אָרֹר *cursed* be thou above all cattle." This was a Curse. God says to the Israelites, "Cursed be he that keepeth not the Covenant." And this was a Curse: the first *absolute*, this *conditional*; but either of them is properly called, a Curse. The saying, *Cursed be every one who keepeth not &c.* is called an *Ale*. *Deut. ch. xxviii, and xxix.* several times. An absolute Curse is also called *Ale*. *Isai.*

Isai. xxiv. 6. " The Curse Ale, has devoured the land." And Jer. xlii. 18. " And ye shall be " לאלה an Execration."

Now the question is whether we depart from the sense of *Ale*, a Curse: because when it ties a person to truth, it is *conditional*; and when it does not, it is not conditional. Or in other words, when it is pronounced with an *if*, it is avoidable; and so the desire of avoiding it has that force upon the mind, which what we call an Oath has; and when it is absolute, it has no such force upon the mind. *Aleim* as a personal *active* noun is *Execrators*, the Denouncers of a Curse, *Alue* is or may be a *passive*, (it can't be *active*,) *participle* or *noun*, for at present it is allowed that *Ale* is the root, which *ex confesso* in *Hebrew* signifies a Curse; only the Doctor would make a Curse, when pronounced *conditionally*, to be a different *idea* from a Curse, when pronounced *absolutely*. Which difference is exprest by the *Adjuncts*, not by the word itself. And the *passive* cannot be *conditional*, because a Curse born is *actual*. And therefore when the Doctor says,

" it cannot signify being under an *actual Execration*, if it signify being under a *conditional one*."

He forgets that *Aleim* and *Alue* are different parts of speech. And his pronoun *it* must refer in one part of his sentence to one word; in the other to the other word. For *Ale*, the verb, doth not signify *being under an Execration*, either *actual* or *conditional*. And he does not observe that *Ale* the noun is a Curse, whether *actual* or *conditional*; and

and so he includes *two ideas and very different ones* in the meaning of the word, neither of which belong to it, and this it is which has bred so much confusion all along. I stated this several times, *inter al.* p. 32, 34, 42, *et seq.* No person therefore was אלוה *passively* cursed, by saying *may I be cursed if* &c. and yet saying so was properly called *a Curse*. And *conditionally* cursed, unless it means pronouncing the words over him, with an exception, *if*, is a contradiction in terms, because it supposes a person to be, what he only *may be*, by and by.

This was the answer I gave more at large to the question, *why is not every person אלוה who is under the Curse?* or has submitted to have it inflicted upon him *conditionally*, i. e. if he falsify.

But the Doctor says, *Review*, p. 195. as cited above,

“ This Mr. *Bate* would avoid by saying that

“ אלה is not applicable to men; only to the

“ pronouncers of the Curse; to those to whom

“ the supreme power belongeth, consequently *no*

“ *man* can be אלוה but the God-man.”

I said, that the people were not *Aleim*, because they neither did, nor had power to pronounce the Curse for themselves or others, p. 43. And that אלוה *as a name of God*, is applicable to that person of Jehovah only, who was *unconditionally* subjected to a Curse, which the God-man only was. Not that *no man* could be called by this name, who should be under an absolute Execration. See *Scrip. Mean.* p. 56. “ As signifying
“ *accursed*,

“ *accursed, and applied to one of the Persons*
 “ *of Jehovah, it could not mean any other of*
 “ *those persons, but he, who in man was*
 “ *made a Curse.*” With what fidelity and
 Candour the Doctor cites me, let the Reader
 judge. But such misrepresentations can do him
 no service or credit.

After the indirect answers the Doctor makes
 for me to his objections; he repeats the same
 questions over again, without seeming to observe
 it; the former answers of his own making for
 me, not being satisfactory to himself.

“ *But still if the pronouncer of the Curse included*
 “ *himself, as Mr. Bate often tells us, why is not*
 “ *each of the divine Persons אֱלֹהִים?*” p. 195.
 — *If the pronouncer included himself*—in what?
 why in the promise to bear a Curse, *if* &c. Could
 the pronouncer include himself in the Curse, in
 any other sense, than by a promise or stipulation
 to submit to it if he falsified? He *included* himself
 in the *words of the Curse* when they were general,
 and so was *bound by, or under*, i. e. liable to, it; but
 not *unconditionally or certainly* as our Saviour was
 from before the world. And tho’ any person might
 have been called אֱלֹהִים who was under an *actual Ex-*
ecration, yet that word is applied to none in Scrip-
 ture but a Person of Jehovah; tho’ saying that the
 אֱלֹהִים *devoured the land*; and *ye shall be לְאֱלֹהִים a*
Curse, is equivalent, to saying the land was אֱלֹהִים,
 and ye shall be אֱלֹהִים. But the word I suppose
 was set apart from common use to preserve the
 dignity

dignity of its application to that great Person, who became אלהים in our stead.

Whether it may be my less conspicuous way of writing, or the Doctor's unwillingness to consider my reply, that has occasioned all these words, I cannot tell. But I think he may here see, that the ground his objections are built upon is a mistake of what the pronouncers of a Curse included themselves in, not a Curse actual or certain, which it must have been, to make אלהים applicable to each of them.

The Doctor goes on, p. 196.

“ If each bound himself, the binder and the
“ bound is the same person—”

He is so.

“ expressed by the same action.”

I don't well know what this means. He that binds himself is the *binder* and *bound*, by the same *action*, or, same words; but he that says, *may I be cursed, if I do not keep my word*, tho' he is the pronouncer of a Curse, doth not curse himself; or make himself *accursed*; but yet he *binds* himself, and is *bound*. *Execrator*, in *Latin*, is one who pronounces a Curse; and says (e. g.) *may I be cursed if I prove false*, is he *execratus*, by saying so, because he is bound by it? And it is surprising to me what all this puzzle is about, unless it was designed.

“ But Mr. *Bate* distinguishes further, p. 55. that

“ *cursed* is one who suffers the Curse, which he

“ is not, who is put *under* the Curse (*conditionally*)

“ nally) — yet we cannot say *actually accursed*, as
 “ Christ was.”

And is not this right! No. *It is not consistent with Mr. Hutchinson's account of אלוה Review, p. 196.* And so the Doctor leaves this answer of mine, and what is urged in support of it, only calling it a *further distinction*, without considering in the least whether it would help him out of the puzzle he is in or no. And goes on to another point. The Doctor never cares to apply the direct meaning of אלה, as an *active personal noun*; or of אלוה as a *passive*, to clear up his objections; either because he cannot get over the prejudice of אלהים being a *passive*, and the plural of אלוה, as the cursed Apostates have taught us; or that he has been so long used to think them foreign words, that he can't, tho' only for argument's sake, suppose them *Hebrew*; or see them in the light they would appear in; if he could impartially, for a moment or two, consider them according to their *Hebrew* construction.

Mr. Kalmar, who was a long while before he could get this prejudice so far out of his head as even to apprehend what we were driving at; at length breaks out as in surprise, p. 28. of his Answer to me, after a fair citation from *Scrip. Mean.*

“ It is as far as I can see here and in the two next
 “ pages, *quite a new scheme*; to wit, *Aleim* be-
 “ ing in *Kal benoni*, denotes *Cursers*, those who
 “ denounce a *Curse*, and *Aloah* being in *pabul-kal*,
 “ signifies *cursed*; so that the three Persons, in
 O “ Trinity,

“ Trinity, can be said *Aleim* ; and the second Per-
 “ son is not only comprehended therein, but also
 “ is stiled (which neither of the other is) *Aloah*.
 “ Consequently perhaps there is in the Bible nei-
 “ ther a plural for *Aloah* ; nor a singular for *A-*
 “ *leim*, if this be Mr. Bate’s scheme : he indeed
 “ who with some others reads אֱלֹהִים, *Aleim*,
 “ may go on with it pretty well—but there is
 “ no other singular for *Aleim* (Elohim) but *Eloah*.”

This is the scheme ; and this Gentleman seems to
 have got twenty pages in his answer to it, before he
 had found out what he was to answer ; and I have
 no other objection to his way of stating it, but
 that upon this scheme there is, he thinks, no sin-
 gular for *Aleim*, but *Aloah* or *Eloah*, because there
 is the singular אֱלֹה, as a name of God, several
 times used. There is *no plural* indeed of *Aloah* or
Alue, used in the Bible, tho’ אֱלֹהִים occur so ma-
 ny hundreds of times it never once has a *Vau* in it.
 Which the Gentlemen have not applied them-
 selves to give a satisfactory reason for.

The Doctor has some how or other got it into
 his head that the word אֱלֹה must signify a *vica-*
rious Execration, because our Saviour was *made*
a Curse for us. Dr. Sharp in his *Differ.* p. 47.
 puts the Case,

“ If it be said, that אֱלֹה is only used to denote
 “ a *vicarious Execration*—it would be but rea-
 “ sonable to demand where it is the word is so
 “ used.”

And then in a long note proves that we do believe
Christ was made a Curse for us ; instead of prov-
 ing

ing that we allow the word אלוה to signify a *vicarious Curse*. In order to set the Doctor right, I replied, p. 56. that

“ Aloah doth not signify a *vicarious Execra-*
 “ *tion*, nor do they ever say so, in order to
 “ account for the meaning of the word as ap-
 “ plied to Christ: he would not have been *A-*
 “ *loah*, had it not been necessary for him to be
 “ so in our stead, if he would save us; but
 “ he was really and in fact made a *Curse*.”

And therefore the meaning of אלוה as applied to Christ doth not depend upon the *design*, but *reality* of his sufferings. - Being called *καταρα* by the Apostle, and אלוה by the Prophets because he really suffer'd. One would have thought this a plain answer, and to have set his indistinct objection from the word *vicarious* in a clear light. And that the Doctor would either have acknowledged his mistake, or have set himself to prove, that *the word* אלוה according to us, tho' I denied it, did signify a *vicarious Curse*. Instead of this, he persists in his mistake, repeats, and proves it over again in the same manner—*Review*, p. 197.

“ But Mr. Bate now says (*as if Mr. Bate had ever said or thought otherwise.*) “ that Aloah
 “ doth not signify a *vicarious Execration*.—They
 “ have not indeed used the words *vicarious Exe-*
 “ *cration* but they have used words equivalent,
 “ see my citations from them p. 48 and 49. as
 “ *for or instead of man; to satisfy the justice,*
 “ (these are Mr. Bate's words, *Examiner Exa-*

“ *min'd p. 25.) which man could not do for himself.* ”
 The Curse which Christ underwent was indeed a *vicarious* one, (if I must use that uncouth word) but neither אלוה nor καταρα signify a *vicarious* Curse. Instead of proving against me, that the word אלוה according to Mr. *Hutchinson* and myself, signifies a *vicarious Curse*, he proves again that we believe that Christ was *made a vicarious Curse*, which is a proposition of a quite different nature. And one would have thought he must have seen it at first; much more when it was directly pointed out to him. Whether it be owing to a confused head, or there be a design in it, let the Reader judge. But it is something very extraordinary to think to put it a second time upon his Reader, that *Curse* must signify a *vicarious* Curse, because that which Christ underwent was *vicarious*: and that we allowed the word had this *meaning*, because we believe the Curse on Christ had that design.

I am afraid there is *malice prepense* at the bottom here, because, upon the strength of this reasoning, *if so be it may be called reasoning*, he accuses me of *denying that Christ suffer'd for us*; a charge of a very severe nature, which if it were not as weakly proved, as it is strongly urged, I should have reason to condemn myself, and be utterly at a loss for an Apology.

“ Here it is observable, says he, that Mr. *Bate*

“ avoids the repetition of the *whole Expression*

“ made a Curse FOR US, lest it should imply a

“ *vicarious*

“ *vicarious Execration*—p. 198. and p. 203. it
 “ was a vicarious Execration, tho’ Mr. Bate de-
 “ nies it.”

Here he makes me deny that Christ suffered *for us*, and *proves* it, from my allowing that the *whole expression* of the Apostle implies what the *single word* Curse does not. He brings these very words of mine into the page before this, to prove that I allowed that Christ died *in our stead*, or *for us*, and God forbid that any doubt should ever be made of my believing otherwise, unless that doubt be as weakly supported as it is here. But observe the progress and manner of the proof the Doctor would support his accusation by. “ Mr. Bate allows that the word *Curse* signifies a *vicari-ous Curse* ; for he allows that Christ was made a *Curse in our stead*.” And thus having proved that he who allows Christ to have been made a Curse for us, does allow (tho’ the fallacy was pointed out to him) that the word *Curse* implies *vicarious* in it. He argues next “ Mr. Bate denies that Christ was made a Curse in our stead ; 1. *for* he denies that the *Curse* does signify a *vicarious Curse*. 2. He says that Christ *really* suffer’d, therefore he denies that Christ suffer’d *for us*. And it is plain this must be his meaning, because he drops the words *for us*, when he says, Christ was *really* made a Curse ; as if the Curse in reality and in fact were not the same, whether it was born by him as a *surety* or not.” This is the Doctor’s proof ; and by the change of the proposition in dispute, (in the words

words but now cited from him) you are to take it for granted that the dispute was whether the *whole expression* (made a Curse for us) not whether the *single word Curse* implied *vicarious* in it. — Mr. Bate, says he, *avoids the repetition of the whole expression* lest it (the whole expression) should imply a *vicarious Execration*. And upon this mistake he argues, p. 210.

“ Neither was Christ *Eloah*, execrated, by being made a Curse for his brethren, because *Ale* is never used for a *vicarious Execration* (nor is any other single word) and because the *Hebrew word* for his being made a Curse for his brethren, is קללת. ”

It is not the *Hebrew word*, but the *Greek words*, (υπερ ημων,) that imply his being a Curse for his brethren: קללת no more signifies an *Execration for us*, than אלה does. And אלה is as properly render'd *Curse*, as קללת can be. This is well known: for these words are equivalent, tho' not the same, in signification.

If the Doctor did not designedly again change the proposition he was to prove in order to support his charge against me; he may see now that he has thro' some hurry and confusion or other quite mistaken the matter. The whole expression of the Apostle does imply *vicarious* in it. But the *single word* which we were disputing about does not; not including the sense of the many *adjectives* occasionally used with it, in its own meaning. This is not calling me *impious*, as Mr. Kalmar

Kalmar does, but it is trying to make me appear so. For surely I must be ungrateful and wicked to a very high degree to have denied that Christ suffered for us. The inference the Doctor would draw from my words is of such a nature as one would not readily have expected, and his manner of maintaining the charge very extraordinary: he would prove that I omit the words *for us* with an ill design, tho' I use the words *in our stead*, which are full as expressive. And he would prove that I deny Christ died for us, because I deny that the word *Curse* signifies, a *vicarious* Curse. This shews that the Gentleman is compassed about with so great a cloud of prejudices that he can't see clear enough to aim his blows aright.

Next the Doctor argues against me that אלוה, "Must mean, in its usage throughout the old Testament, a person who was *determined* or *obliged* to be execrated, not one who was *actually* or *really* execrated."

As if I had ever said or thought that Christ was made a Curse *in fact* till his Incarnation: and then endeavours to expose me p. 200. because a reference of mine to *Deut.* chap. xxviii and xxxix. is wrong printed, 28. 9.

"Mr. *Bate's* solution of the matter stands thus
 "—the Lord hath brought upon them כל קללה,
 "therefore Christ—was called אלוה."

Let the Reader turn to *Scrip. Mean.* p. 56. at the top of the page. If we read *Deut.* 28. 9. (misprinted for chap. xxviii and xxix.) we find there were many particulars contained under the word אלה;

אלה; and in consequence of which they were finally to be cut off, in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation. They are my words; and the passages I refer to must be where the *particulars* contained in אלה are mentioned, which they are in these two chapters. And all comprised in this word, ch. xxix. ver. 20. כל אלה, *the whole curse written in this book shall lie upon him.* But says the Doctor,

“ The passage referred to, is *Deut. xxix. 28.* for

“ his reference is wrong printed.”

I refer to no single passage, but to these two chapters for proof that there were *many particulars* contained under the word אלה. I refer he says to ver. 28. Why! only because the word is not there, the ideal sense of which I was endeavouring to trace out. Unless what follows may be deemed a reason.

“ The effect of the Curse specified by *rooting them*

“ out of their land in anger &c. is mentioned as

“ the consequence not of אלה, but קללה.”

As if אלה were not used for *the Curse* of God upon them as well as קללה. And their captivity were a consequence of one word more than the other; or it were a consequence of *either word*; and I should be glad to know what he meant, when he said, “ their being rooted out was a consequence, not of אלה, but of קללה.” The Prophet *Daniel* ascribes their captivity to a Curse expressed by the word אלה.

I must remark another *false* citation; for I do not say, that

“ therefore

“ Therefore, Christ was called אלוה.”
 Which the Doctor without the least authority for it, makes me do; but that from that wrath, the effects of which is expressed by אלה, *we may perhaps get the strict idea of the word (אלה) and see in what sense Christ was אלוה.* This is what I say; which he should have cited, and not put words of a quite different import into my mouth. The Doctor borrowed some good directions out of the *Christian Plan*, for making *fair extracts*, and reasoning candidly and soberly upon them, and commends them highly. I am sorry they were not worth his following.

But these, and many other instances, were designed as proofs that

“ He hath no delight in controversy and censures,
 “ and that it hath been his desire and aim to keep
 “ as clear as he could, from what he blames in
 “ others.” See Dedic. to the *Differ.*

Much of the same nature it seems with the last, is my solution of another difficulty started by the Doctor against our construction of *Aloah*, viz. Christ being called so before he was execrated *in fact*. And he is pleased to argue with me in much the same manner by way of condescension to my weakness, by making me say what I have neither said; nor have given any room to suppose me to say.

“ —But he could not be called the *Execrated*,
 “ meaning *really* and *in fact*, as distinguished
 “ from *purpose* or *destination*, which is the sense
 “ Mr. Bate is now insisting upon.”

P

I have

I have said no such thing ; nor have given, that I know of any colour for it. I say Christ is called *the execrated one*, as he is called, the *Lamb slain* before he was slain. The reality of Christ's becoming a Curse had been maintained by us against Mr. Bd. And in *Script. Mean.* p. 56, 57. I argued with the Doctor, that the word *Curse* or *אלוה* was applied to him because, he was made a *real*, not because he was made a *vicarious* Curse ; but the opposition of *the fact* to the *purpose* or *destination*, never came into the dispute that I know of before, nor was mentioned till now. Should not the Doctor have cited some words of mine, to shew that I asserted that Christ was *really* and *in fact* execrated, before he took flesh, when he endeavours by that supposition to avoid an easy and obvious answer, to an objection he builds so much upon ?

“ The Lamb, says the Doctor, is no otherwise
 “ said to be slain from the foundation of the
 “ world, than in God's counsel and determina-
 “ tion.” p. 201.

And I have said, that Christ is called, *the execrated one*, in the same sense the Lamb is said to be slain. “ And even that was not said, (adds our learned adversary,) till the Lamb was actually slain.” But still he is called the *Lamb slain*, from before he was slain.

“ This Text therefore in the *Revelations*, says
 “ he, can be no authority for saying that Christ
 “ might be called *אלוה*, *really* and *in fact* *exe-*
 “ *crated*, from the foundation of the world, or be-
 “ fore,

“ *fore*, because he was not, as Mr. *Hutchinson*
 “ observes, *actually execrated*, till he took flesh.
 “ And so Mr. *Bate* seemed to think himself, when
 “ he said he *was to do* and suffer—one who is
 “ made, OR TO BE MADE a Curse. ”

The Doctor has proved that I more than seemed to think, that Christ was not cursed before *he suffered*, but he has forgot to prove that I have said or thought otherwise; that you are to take for granted. The Scriptures call, Christ, *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*; and why not call him, *the execrated one*, before he was *in fact* execrated? He was slain, the Doctor says, only *in God's counsel and determination*; but Christ was slain in *type* and *figure*, which is something more than *Determination*. However, if he could be called the *Lamb slain* in counsel, he certainly might be called *the Execrated*, in counsel. He would not have been called the *Lamb slain*, in counsel, had he not have been to be *really slain*; neither would he have been called *Execrated*, but from his real Sufferings. And yet this is not saying, as the Doctor tells his Reader I do, that Christ was *really* and *in fact* execrated before he took flesh.

“ Mr. *Bate* tries another way in answer to my
 “ question, says the Doctor.—He had sworn
 “ (said Mr. *Bate*) he would become a Curse, and
 “ *calls things that be not, as though they were.* ”

But this is not another way; only bringing the authority of the Apostle to justify it. And the Doctor seems disposed to dispute with the Apostle,

by asking, if God did ever *call himself what he was not, as tho' he were*. Which he evidently does when he calls himself the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world : and which form of speech God uses when he calls the Sacrifice (*int. al.*) the Burnt-offering, before it was burnt. *Lev. i. 4. He shall put his hand upon the head of the Burnt-offering.* And the prophetic stile speaks, generally, of the *future*, in the past tense; that which God hath sworn shall be done, being looked on as done. So Christ was called, *the Person, the Execration, or the Execrated*, ex futuro; tho' the *Hebrew* word doth not express the *tense* (tho' it does the voice;) as the *Greek* for *slain* does. *Præteritum*, (says *Bythner*, de verbo p. 9.) *apud Prophetas creberrime pro futuro usurpatur, quo res certe futura, significetur, perinde ac si jam evenisset.*

The Doctor concludes that his *difficulties* could not be *small which have driven Mr. Bate to these solutions of them*; and shew him to be so *soresly pressed for a reply of some sort or other*. But they are his own replies not mine, that make so bad a figure; and which he has been at so much pains to explode. And it may fairly be concluded that he did not like the *solutions* as they stand in my words; or care to reply to what I have said; or else he would have fairly cited, and soberly consider'd it.

The Doctor argues, that the word which the Apostle refers to, *Gal. iii. 13.* when he gives Christ the title of *the Execration*, is אלהו קללת not אלהו.

“ And

“ And it is but just, (he says p. 204. and I agree with him in it) to understand St. Paul’s expression according to the meaning of the Hebrew words in the Law, to which he refers us for that expression.”

When the Apostle says Christ has *redeemed us from the Curse of the Law*, as he does in the Text, he refers us to those words, *therefore* by which the *Curse of the Law* is expressed, and אלה is one of those words; and it will follow by parity of reasoning that Christ may be called the אלה (and with the addition of the ך in the third order, to make it a personal-passive noun, the אלוה) of the Law. And here I must remind the Reader of what he has seen but too much of, that the good Doctor has a peculiar talent at giving an objection *a cast*, when he lays it before him. We do not argue that Christ is called אלוה because he is called קללת; but as they are words of an *equivalent*, (as many other words are, which are not of the same) signification, we say it is not, *blasphemy*, (as Mr. Bd. with open mouth roared out against us, and in which no doubt he would have been followed, had not *our capital argument* stood in the way) to say, that Christ was אלוה as well as קללת: and our *capital argument*, when it comes to be examined is a *voucher*, and *inflexible witness* for us. A voucher, that the sacred writers intended to give Christ the title of, *Execrated*, which is what we bring it for. And that we *may* apply to Christ one of those words that

that stand for *the Curse of the Law*, as well as another.

The Doctor has another objection against the application of *Ale* to Christ as a *Curse*, p. 207.

“ *Deut. xxx. 7.* It relates only to temporal Curses.

“ — The Curse that Christ was *made for us*

“ cannot be interpreted of these.”

And so does קללה, as the Doctor himself says but a few lines above.

“ *Deut. xxix. 28.* אלה is not the word for *the*

“ *Curse*, but קללה, and relates only to God’s

“ rooting *Israel* out of the land.”

But as I observed before, *the whole Curse written in the book of the Law* is *Deut. xxix. ver. 20.* (and which seems misprinted (*Deut. xxix. 29.*) in *Mr. Moody’s Answer* p. 9. note lin. 8.) expressed by this word, which implies something more than a *temporal Curse*, namely, the wrath of God, that would, if not atoned here, end in everlasting misery. And the Doctor seems not to have recollected that one word is not confined to temporal Curses more than the other, tho’ the ink was not dry on the paper, where he had himself made the observation.

It seems strange to the Doctor that Christ should be named *Aloab*, or *Execrated*, which they are, who break an Oath, tho’ he himself did break no Oath. I hope that wonder is cleared up; and is so indeed in the place whence he cites those words of mine (p. 211.) which raised his wonder, *viz.* because אלה signifies a *Curse*
in

in general. And a person may be *curfed* without breaking an Oath.

But there is a stranger thing still than this same strange saying of mine. And it is the construction of קללה which a writer of great reputation applies as a reasonable and satisfactory proof that אלוה is to be construed in its *Hebrew* sense, because such a *remarkable agreement of facts and circumstances strongly plead for it*. And this is answered by saying, *the learned author represents the relation between the two words, as suppositions only, from which nothing certain can be deduced*. Whereas he represents it as what nothing can be objected to, but *minute* reasons drawn from *specs and dots*, and *rabbinical inventions of arbitrary rules and exceptions*. But suppose, says the Doctor, that אלוה is one *execrated*, yet is not his inference just that it most properly and eminently describes a sufferer under the קללה, i. e. under the Curse of being emptied of his glory. But if אלוה is one *accursed*, the object of the wrath of God and man; and קללה one *made light of*, and treated as such by God and man; and both names are used to the same person, must there not be something stronger than a dash or two of the pen of the execrable Apostates, to forbid the similar and parallel construction? What follows p. 213. of *Aloah* not being a peculiar title of the second Person, because the whole Trinity were involved in an *Ale*, is the old mistake that *Execrator* and *Execratus* signify the same thing; tho' every school-boy will see the difference at the first look.

The

The Doctor concludes this section with saying, that he sees not that his objections are got over, and he leaves it to his Reader to judge whether they can be got over, on Mr. *Hutchinson's* and Mr. C.'s construction of the words in dispute; and I beg leave to say, it is impossible he should see it himself, or his Reader be able to judge from him, whether they are, or can be got over upon that construction, till he knows himself what it is; and will fairly and impartially lay the replies before his Reader; which I leave to my Reader to judge how far he has done. And I proceed now to

Section 9. *Review* p. 215.

We are here to consider what part of speech **אלהים** and **אלוה** are. *Aleim* has no *vau* in it, as *Alue* has; and therefore we call one an *active*; and the other a *passive*, as *all the grammars* direct us to understand the *vau* in the third order.

First, the Doctor says, that this,

“Supposes a noun of the same letters with the
“the verb in the perfect tense, cannot be under-
“stood in a passive sense.”

Which it by no means does; for it is well known that in *Hebrew* as in *English*, the same (letters or) word, shall be *all parts of speech*—determinable by the Context; but not without it. Can the Doctor take upon him to say, that **עָרַךְ**, **שָׁלוּחַ**, and **כָּתוּב** are *nouns*, or *passives*, as they stand here detached from the Context? But he can at first sight determine that **שָׁלוּחַ**, **כָּתוּב** and the like, are *passives*. **אלה** might be construed *passively*, if the Context any where required it. But **אלוה** can't

can't be *active*. Aleim from *Ale* to worship (if there were any such verb) can be nothing but *worshippers*, unless the Context should any where direct to the contrary; which is not so much as pretended. There is nothing in the *letters* to make it a *passive*. And where the grammatical signs are wanting, the parts of speech that are distinguished by those signs, must be wanting likewise, unless the Context supply them. And a writer that should omit the *grammatical signs*, without directing you by the Context to supply them, would write unintelligibly. And consequently that where the *sign* is wanting, and the Context doth not direct you, the word must be deemed of that part of speech it is of without the sign. אלהים has no grammatical sign but the *plural* ם; no *passive vau*; and the Context, wherever it occurs, directs you to understand it of a person or persons, and therefore it must mean what words do without the *passive vau*. A Prophet could neither deceive us thro' design, ignorance or carelessness. He combined his words so as to be understood; being infallibly directed to convey his meaning. We have no reason to think from any *grammatical sign*, or the Context, that *Aleim*, a name of God, was designed as a *passive*, and thereby are directed to conclude it to be *active*. And on the contrary, *Alue* has the *vau*, the *passive sign* in it. The Prophets neither wrote nor spoke by the *points*. And the letters is all they have left us to understand their meaning by.

They that are so fetter'd with the Rabbinical

Q

shackles

shackles as not to care to stir a foot till gored on by the *pricks*, may perhaps not readily acknowledge the truth of what I say ; but it is what all grammars, but the *Hebreo-rabbinical*, proceed upon. And the ascertaining the parts of speech, where the signs were wanting, was one of the outward pretences for introducing the points. And I hope Christians may without vanity say, that they are as capable of determining by the Context what part of speech a word is of, as the apostate Rabble were, when they set the points. The Context was all the guide they could have ; and that we have, and something more, *viz.* the assistance of that Holy Spirit, which had forsaken those wicked men, and turned to the *Gentiles*.

The grammatical *signs* then and the Context, are the rules or means ; which, with the help of God, we hope to be able to ascertain the *Hebrew* grammar by ; and when neither the Context nor *the signs* direct us to make a word *singular* and *passive*, we conclude necessarily that it is *plural* and *active*. And whatever they may think of themselves, who make use of their learning and abilities to confound the obvious rules of the tongue, (with regard to words that relate to our eternal Salvation, as they construe in *Hebrew*) others will look on as fighting under the banner of Apostacy against the Truth of the word of God. It had never enter'd into the heart of man to make *Aleim* a passive ; if the Devil had not suggested it to the Apostates.

“ One might reasonably infer (says the Doctor,
p. 216.)

p. 216.) that the plural of *Alue* might signify
 “ *worshipped.* ”

But the plural of *Alue* must be found first. It is the plural of *Ale* we are disputing about.

“ But as I take it (continues the Doctor,) here
 “ is a mystery, in his way of writing *Aleim*—
 “ he drops the *vau*—to extinguish the *vowel*
 “ *vau* in the pronunciation of *Elohim.* ”

Has the Doctor but just found out our design in writing אֱלֹהִים *Aleim*? It is certainly our design to mark out the difference betwixt the plural of אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים. But the mystery, and the mystery of iniquity it is, lays in pointing, writing or pronouncing it *Elohim*, as if it had a *vau*. And I must except against the Doctor's language of our *dropping*, and extinguishing the *vowel vau*. If he means a letter, it never was there to be dropt, or *extinguished*. If he means the *point*, he should remember that he has for the present given them up. If he means *both*, and used the ambiguous phrase of *vowel vau*, to be interpreted either way, as occasion should serve, let him make his best of it: But he must give us some better proof, than this that,

“ The *vau* was suppressed in writing אֱלֹהִים ” and
 “ that it is or can be, the *regular* plural of
 “ אֱלֹהִים. ”

Which it certainly is not; as all the grammars without exception will justify. And tho' many plurals in *im*, without a *vau*, must be construed *passively*, yet it is the Context, and not their *regular* deflection that directs us to construe them so.

He may as well say רכבה *Isai. i. 6.* is the *regular plural and passive*, of רכך

The Doctor gave the sense of אלהים, *Differ. p. 71.* as from an *Arabic* word, “*The Being that ought only to be adored.*” On which I remarked, that אלהים is not *passive*, *adored* is; and *only* cannot be comprised in the verb. And here *Review p. 71.* says,

“I had given the sense of *Eloah* from *Alah.*”

But it was the sense of אלהים not *Eloah*, he gave in the words above; and thinks what we have been a considering, is a sufficient answer; but adds,

“I will give a distinct answer to this and another
“objection of Mr. *Bate's*, and justify my own
“expression, that *Eloah* (he should have said
אלהים again) may signify a *Being to be adored.*”

I was to have a distinct answer to this, (and another) objection; which seems to have been forgot. My other objection, I suppose is, that there is no participle in *Hebrew* that answers to the participle in *dus* in *Latin*; and that the *vau* in אלה, or in the third order, doth not admit of any such construction, which the Doctor cites along with this question of mine, from *Examiner Examined, p. 14.*

“Do אלה and אלה imply a future in them, to be
“worshipped?”

“Yet, says he, according to Mr. *Hutchinson's*
“own exposition it implies a future”—in *dus*, he should have said.

Mr. *Hutchinson's* words are,

“The Text, (*Isai. xlv. 8.*) is,—*who exetrated*
“beside

“ *beside Jehovah?* When *Isaiab* was written he

“ was not *actually execrated*. *There is no tense*.

“ This reacheth from the fall of man to the fact”

“ —He was obliged absolutely *to be execrated*. ”

There is no tense in אֱלֹהִים says Mr. *Hutchinson*. And this the Doctor brings to prove that אֱלֹהִים according to Mr. *Hutchinson* is equivalent to the participle in *dus*. Christ *was obliged to be absolutely execrated* in due time, and therefore is called *the Execrated*. *There is no tense*, says Mr. *Hutchinson*, therefore according to him, argues Dr. *Sharp*, it is the *future tense*. If there be no *tense* in אֱלֹהִים, according to us, my question is not answered upon Mr. *Hutchinson's principles*, as the Doctor gives his word for, *Review* p. 219. for tho' the time was to come when this was to be done, yet the word of itself doth not express that it has no *tense*, any more than *Execratio* in *Latin* has.

“ His title *Eloah* altogether related to a future

“ transaction. ”

True. But the word *Eloah* expresses neither *past* nor *future*, merit or demerit, and so not the *participle in dus*.

“ And why should Mr. *Bate* blame his adversary,

“ says the Doctor, for giving a construction like

“ the participle in *dus*, from *Alah coluit*, when

“ both he and Mr. *Hutchinson* give the like con-

“ struction?—”

The like construction would make אֱלֹהִים, signify *execrable*, for that is equivalent to *adorable*, or a Being to be adored.

But

But Mr. *Bedford* and others did not intend to confine the participle in *dus* to the *future exclusive of past or present*, says the Doctor; nor do we on our side, however he came to think so.

“ — Not in the sense of *Cultus*, worshipped, as Mr. *Bate* and Mr. *Moody* put it,
 “ — but as Mr. *Holloway* takes their meaning
 “ right. — ” p. 220.

Which seems to say that we had mistaken their meaning.

“ — *A Being that ought only to be adored.* I
 “ meant it, says the Doctor, in the sense of —
 “ *adorable.* ”

The dispute is not about his meaning of *colendus*, but whether there is such a participle in *Hebrew*, which I say, the ׀ in the third order is not: because the words that have the ׀ there will not one in a hundred make sense or truth according to that construction. And *only* cannot be comprised in the verb, he allows;

“ Yet it cannot be excluded from the sense of the
 “ participle — ” he says;

but it must be excluded, if it is no part of the sense of the verb; tho' it belongs to God to be worshipped, and to him only;

“ — In its application to the true object of worship ”
 That is, God *only* is to be worshipped, therefore the word includes *only* in its meaning. A way of reasoning the Doctor is very fond of.

“ — Is there *Eloah* besides me? who is *Eloah*
 “ but *Jehovah*? can these passages be interpreted
 “ with the like propriety, or indeed with any pro-
 “ priety

“ propriety and truth under Mr. *Bate's* construction ? ”

I have shewn him the beauty and propriety of these passages, as well as truth. That no false God could be the Execration, Atoner or Sufferer for man, Jehovah only being able to perform that great work in a state of incarnation. Here is truth and propriety, and the noblest challenge God could make against their false Gods.

But the Doctor forgets all along here that **אלהים** is applied to men, as well as to God. — *I have said ye are אלהים, to be adored; as the Doctor's phrase is; religiously to be worshipped, according to Mr. Bd. Could not the Doctor see this impropriety in Mr. Bd.'s construction of the word, when he left religiously out of his own, and blames me for not letting Mr. Bd.'s stand, as he had put it? And how does that comport with Isai. xliv. 8. Who is Eloah but God? Some men were so, the SS. says, and the Scripture can't be broken. Aleim he may see here, can't be construed in the same sense with Eloah; and I would once more recommend it to the consideration of our opponents, whether their exposition of these words, and these Texts can be any ways reconciled.*

“ He attempts indeed (says the Doctor,) to fasten
 “ a like difficulty on Mr. *Bd.*—but if he will
 “ please to put it as Mr. *Bd.* did, *The Being re-*
 “ *ligiously to be worshipped*, he will find there is
 “ no impropriety in it.”

I don't say, nor hint that Mr. *Bd.* didn't put it so.
 He

He did put it so, but it would not stand so by his own rules; he run himself into difficulties by it, he did not foresee; but the Doctor is going to help him out.

“ מטהר *Lev. xiv.* which he renders by, *him that*

“ *was to be cleansed.* So *Pagnin* *mandatum*, i. e.

“ *mundandum.* ”

He that was cleansing, the cleanser, or that was going to be cleansed, are all the same thing. And I apprehend is the future in *rus*; not in *dus*, in the sense they construe their *Arabic* word, to make it signify *adorable*, one that is worthy of worship. And the word makes as good sense construed as in the Text of *Pagnin's* translation, *Purificans se.* But the participle or noun with מ, as here, doth not imply a *future* in itself; and tho' the person spoke of *ver. 4.* was then to be cleansed; yet he is called by the same name after he was cleansed, *ver. 31.* And נורא *Psal. lxxxix. 8.* makes as good sense there as a *passive*; feared; so מהלל *praised.* כבודא *glorious* or *glorified.* But these *participles* construed as in *dus*; on other occasions imply direct falsehoods. *Baal* was feared, and had in reverence by his worshippers, but was not worthy to be feared, and to be had in reverence of them. The great Person who *Isai. liii.* was despised, ידוע *afflicted, bruised,* and נכה *smitten,* was not worthy or deserving of it: God is worthy to be praised and feared; but the worthiness is not expressed in those participles, but belongs to his own nature. Nor did I except against the *English* phrases, *to be worshipped,* or, *to be adored,* as having a future in them, but as the *Hebrew* for them

them is supposed to carry the sense of the participle in *dus*; which if it do in one place, it must in another. The participle *Pabul* all agree is *preter* or *past*.

“ — They signify no more, according to the
 “ usage of the language, (says the Doctor) than
 “ *worthy of worship.* ”

But if he could prove the *Hebrew participles* signified *so much* according to the usage of that language, there would be an end of the dispute.

But we shall have occasion perhaps to re-examine some of these constructions, and the *new Hebrew* participles, before we have done; but I must now turn back to consider the objections about the *mappicked* ה, or double root, *Ale* is supposed to be of, which the Doctor premised to his reasoning on the sense of the word.

R E V I E W, Sect. II. p. 27.

WE have here a finished piece, which the artist has bestowed so much pains and labour upon, and viewed so long, and with such deep attention and pleasure, that he has persuaded himself, like the famous *Praxiteles*, into a notion that his statue has life and motion; but it doth not quite come up to life. And tho' its breast may seem to heave, its eyes are mere stone.

“ Various, says the Doctor, are the expedients
 “ my opponents have tried to disengage themselves
 “ from the difficulties the distinction between the
 “ *mutable* and *immutable* ה, brings upon the ety-
 “ mology of *Elohim*. ”

He means אלהים; but there is no word in the Bible that can be wrote *Elohim*, unless you set the authority of the Apostates above that of the Prophets, who no doubt spoke as they wrote; or the ear must have been subject to the same uncertainty, the eye is, by this way of writing it in *English*. And if they writ אלהים universally without a *vau*, let the Doctor consider what spirit directed them, upon whose authority he puts it in. But to these imaginary difficulties, which are as various as the *expedients* we have made use of to disengage ourselves from them. That is, we have followed the Doctor step by step, and returned him an answer to every thing he thought, in the warmth of his prepossession, worth proposing.

The

The Distinction so much weight is laid upon, is this, that the irregular verbs in ה, do not retain that letter in the *noun plural* and *participle passive*, and therefore *Aleim* and *Alue* are not derived from *Ale*, tho' there is no other root in the tongue they can come from ; nor was there any other tongue for above two thousand years to borrow a word or a rule of grammar from.

“ אלהים being a noun plural, the preservation of
 “ the ה in it, shews it must be derived from some
 “ perfect verb in which the ה never changes or is
 “ lost, as גבהים from גבה *Differ.* p. 9. and p. 10.
 “ Therefore this אלה cannot be the root of אלוה,
 “ which is, *as they own*, formed like גבוה,” in
 these two deflections ; as אמה, בלה, and נוה are
 in several others ; and all the *anoamla* in some.

This is the sum of the difficulties, and *decisive evidence* against our etymology. In answer to which we have denied both the *minor* and *consequence*, viz. that גבה is a regular verb ; or if it were so, that it would follow that the irregular verbs in ה could not decline like it in these deflections, because they do not in all. These are the *various expedients* we have made use of to shelter ourselves from this fell monster. The Reader, it is to be hoped, will not rest his judgement either upon what is said in the *Review*, or in this *Reply* ; but see and judge for himself upon a view of the whole that has been laid before him.

But let us state a few particulars that the Reader may be a better judge of the argument.

There are five nouns that retain their ה in the
 R 2 plural

plural number, and many nouns or participles that retain their ה with the *vau* and *jod* in the third order, in the singular. אלה and גבה in the masculine plural only. And תמה, נגה, גבה and כלה in the feminine plural. But passive nouns or participles in the singular there are many. Some with a *jod*, and some with a *vau*. There are four verbs or roots in ה called *perfect*. תמה, נגה, גבה, and (I think) כמה. This last occurs only once undeflected, and so is no instance: תמה but seldom; and where it does, it is shrewdly to be suspected, that it is in *Hithpael*, or such deflections when its ת may be a *servile*, and not radical, and so its root be תמה; as will appear upon examination perhaps. נגה is not very often used: but *twice* or *thrice* where the ה is usually dropt or changed. We have הגיה and נגהות, and נגה in *regim*: But not נגהים or נגוה. So that the chief weight of the argument lays on גבה, which retains its ה in almost every deflection; it being a word very often used. But, if we are not mistaken, it likewise drops or changes its ה in some places, as the roots in ה for the generality do; some in one deflection; others in another; and some in *the same deflections* in different Texts. The imperfect verbs, says *Bythner*, in his first remark upon them, *non semper sunt anomala, neque etiam in omnibus conjugationibus aut temporibus*.

What is there now to justify our arguing backwards, that a word which is *regular* in this part of speech, (the noun plural suppose, or participle passive) must be regular as a verb? or that that which is irregular as a verb, in
some

some deflections, must be irregular as a noun or participle? גבה (contrary to the *general* observation on words in ה) is, (as we allow for the present) always regular, and keeps its ה in every deflection; but אלה, contrary to the general observation, (as we also allow for the present) retains its ה in the noun plural and passive singular. But why must its *verb* be regularly deflected because that of גבה is, whose deflection is itself an exception from the general observation, and is the only instance of any root in ה, that is, what they call, regularly deflected throughout? If these deflections of *Ale* must be supposed to come from a perfect verb, all the deflections that retain the ה should by this rule be deemed to belong to a perfect verb. And *vice versa*; where ever the ה is dropt that word should belong to the imperfect root. And how are we to know what are regular and what not; or in what parts of speech they are regular, and in what not, but by observation of the usage in Scripture, some being more irregular than others, and none of them in all deflections? This was offer'd to the consideration of the Gentlemen by me *Script. Mean.* p. 16, 17. and Mr. *Kalmar* was so sensible of the difficulty, that he really makes נוה p. 7. to be two roots, because it sometimes retains, at others drops and changes its ה.

- “ Upon this account, says he, I presume to make
 “ the same distinction between נוה and נוה, as
 “ between אלה and אלה. נוה with a mutable ה
 “ —properly signifies *immorari*, &c. an habita-
 “ tion, wheresoever, whether in a Text &c. or
 “ without

“ without it. And if ever it signify an house or
 “ tent, it is metonymical—.”

One would think, that if the verb be *to dwell*, the noun must, without a *metonymy*, signify, a *dwelling*.

“ —The latter contrariwise signifies properly
 “ *elatum fuit*, *eminuit*, (*he does not tell us where*)
 “ *ædificium*; so an house, &c. and metonymi-
 “ cally an inhabitation, but in *an house* &c. and
 “ not in any place without it.”

I have cited this that the Reader may see what straits the defenders of double rooted words, the natural born sons of *mappick*, run themselves into. This learned Gentleman could not help seeing that *נוה* is as irregularly deflected as *אלה*; and owns that there are eleven places, where its *ה* is not altered, as (by their reasoning about the *mappicked ה*) it ought to have been; and in which situation that in *אלה* is; and therefore sets it up as another instance of a double rooted word; ascribing all the deflections where the *ה* is preserved, to one root; and where they are dropt or changed, to the other. But the two roots must have different significations, or else all is gone still; so the mutable root, he makes *dwelling in any dwelling place; in a house or tent, &c.* tho' there is no place a person can dwell in, but it must be a *house, tent, or &c.* and if it ever signifies a house or tent; (which it most certainly does, 2 Sam. xv. 25. *נוהו*, the Tabernacle of God. And Job v. 24.) it is a metonymical signification; (he should have said, a substantive,) and the immutable *ה*, contra-
 riwise

riwise an house &c. metonymically an inhabitation, but in a house &c. and not in any place without it. If the Gentleman knew himself what he meant, he has exprest it very unhappily; perhaps for want of *English*; but for my part I can find no difference in the sense of the word in Scripture; nor in his definitions. He, to be sure, aimed at some difference; but I fancy it was mere accident that made him assign this sense to the mutable ה, and that to the immutable one, rather than the contrary. But without spending time in fisting what a man says, when he has not a mind to be understood, what would he gain by finding two roots to נוה? If the sense of אלה and אלה be as nearly the same, as that of *dwelling* and *dwelling*, or *house* and *house*, the imaginary difficulties, the distinction between the two ה's is so loaded with, will never come upon our shoulders; the two roots carrying so nearly the same sense, that in common sense, they are without a *metonymy*, the very same. And we have this instance of נוה to justify us in giving *Ale* the same sense, tho' its roots be different. As well as in supposing that עלה and על, and all the instances of that kind, come from different roots likewise; which would make two of almost every anomalous root in the tongue, without altering their signification. But what do the Gentlemen mean when they talk of two *roots*, consisting of the *same radical* letters? The *Radix*, according to the general sense of Lexicographers and the Grammarians, is the *letters* which compose the *verb*; from whence the other parts

parts of speech are branched out. And the *agent*, and *action* performed are in *Hebrew* expressed by the same letters with the verb. So that two roots consisting of the same letters, is a contradiction in terms; and was invented only to avoid the force of conviction. It would have been impossible for the eye or ear to have distinguished the difference betwixt two such roots, without making two letters of ה, which the Gentlemen do by the way they affect to write it in *English*; writing the mobile ה by *a*, the immobile by *ah*, for which there is no authority in the Text.

Dr. *Sharp* doth not adopt this instance of נִוָּה for two roots, but he imitates the reasoning, and takes the hint from it, to make two roots of אִמָּה, and both signifying a maid-servant. *Review* p. 59. In the *singular*, which has no *plural*, it is the mutable ה; and in the *plural*, which has no *singular*, it is the immutable ה: but still the meaning of the word is the same.

“ The words (says the Doctor, meaning אִמָּה, which he makes two of) “ seem used in both
 “ numbers *indifferently* to denote women-servants,
 “ or female-attendants in general.”

As he had said. p. 55.

“ Tho’ it may be a rare thing, it is not unprece-
 “ dented in the *Hebrew* tongue, for a noun in the
 “ *singular* to be matched in the *plural* with another
 “ of a form something different, tho’ in sense the
 “ same or nearly so.”

His instances are, בַּת *filia*, plural בָּנוֹת. And לֵבָב, whose *plural* is *feminine*, and (says the Doctor on the

the authority of the points,) *masculine both*. If *אמה* whose *plural* does not *rightly* and *grammatically* correspond with its form in the singular, be in sense as *nearly the same*, as the words in the two instances above, what service can the *distinction* he builds so much upon, be to him? for *אמה*, if it were *originally* two words, must also be *originally* of the same signification *by rule*; all the other double rooted words, or *whose characteristics in one deflection do not* rightly agree with their forms in another, carrying the same sense, or so nearly the same, as to require the greatest nicety of judgement to perceive a difference, as well as the most laboured reasoning to point it out.

The Doctor makes no doubt that *Ame* was originally two words in *Hebrew*, tho' *nearly of the same signification*,

“ because these very words, under this distinction

“ are yet retained in the *Syriac*, *Chaldee*, and *A-*

“ *rabic*—thus, for instance, *אמה* *Job* xxxi.

“ 13. is in the *Targum* *אמהות*, which is evidently

“ the *Amah* with the immutable *ה*. ” p. 57.

But *אמהות* is *plural* here in the *Targum*, it retaining the *ה* without a *vau*, in the plural, as in *Hebrew*; see *Gen.* xii. 16. and *Deut.* xii. 12. *et al.* But in the *singular*, it doth not terminate in *ה*.
Next,

“ The *Arabic* expresses the former by *אמי* or *אמו*,

“ *serva facta* fuit. Unde *אמה* *Ancilla*—oppo-

“ nitur ei *חרה* libera. ” p. 57.

This shews that *אמה* in *Arabic* is a servant-maid;
S but

but says nothing about its being two roots. The Doctor tells us indeed, that

“ it expresses the latter, by an אמה, in which
 “ the ה never varies. And it is from hence that
 “ the learned *Schultens*, says the Doctor, deduces
 “ אמהות, *servæ, ancillæ*.”

This should mean that *Schultens* deduces אמהות, which is supposed to be the perfect root, from אמה with an immutable ה, and saying,

“ his words cited out of his MS. Lex. are,”
 gives us reason to expect some proof of his making and proving this distinction; instead of which that learned man only says,

“ Apud Arabes thema אמה cum isto ה mobili
 “ servatur cum duplici usu—primo, *federe ad-*
 “ *dixit*—alter usus est *præcepit, injunxit*. Unde
 “ iterum possit accipi tanquam persona cui quid
 “ præcipitur.”

Here is not a word about אמהות; only that אמה with *that mutable* ה, has two senses in *Arabic*, both proper to the servile condition; not that there are two roots in the *Hebrew*, the one carrying the one; the other, the other sense: but the direct contrary, that an imperfect *Ame* hath two senses. What is this to the deducing of אמהות, which these words were cited for? There is something p. 59. which seems to aim, at making of a proof:

“ As the root *Amah*, according to *Schultens* signifies *præcepit*, as well as *federe addixit*—”

But *Schultens* says nothing about *Amah*, only that
 Ama,

Ama, which is supposed to be another word, signifies so.

“ —The plural of a noun derived from it, *as obtaining the former sense*, will be of equal extent with the noun derived from *Ama*.”

This latter part of the paragraph is too obscure for me to say, with any certainty, what he means by it. And I can make no answer to it. But he concludes that from *these lights*, which are very clear and strong, it seems, that the *singular Ame* is one root in one sense; and the *plural Ameut* from the other root, in the other of the two senses, which *Schultens* ascribes to the *Arabic Ame*, with a moveable א; both words *bearing a servile sense*; but one a *more servile sense* than the other. p. 57, 58. And then gives up all that *this proof* was brought for.

“ If it be asked whether *Amaboth* is found in Scripture to signify at any time *menial maid-servants* —as distinguished from the other *Ama* bearing a *more servile sense*; I cannot say there appears any ground for it.”

Nor does there appear any from *Schultens* for it. This MS. Lex. is not within my reach, and so I can only judge by what is cited from him; which proves the direct contrary, *viz.* that one *Ame* has two senses; not that two *Ames* have one sense. Such reasoning and such proofs are more convincing to the Reader; that the argument from an immutable א, (to prove that אלה has two different and opposite senses, as *cursing* and *worshipping* are) is not defensible, than if our opponents had *totidem verbis* acknowledged it. It is a demon-

stration that it is not to be defended, since even Dr. *Sharp* is forced by it to talk so much like *his* opponents, being *driven to these solutions*; and every word he says, shewing *how sorely he is pressed for a reply of some sort or other*.

If you allow him that *Ame* is two roots in *Syriac*, *Chaldee* and *Arabic*: If you allow that *Schultens* deduces *ameut*, with an immutable *e*, by giving us the sense of *Ame*, with a mutable *one* in *Arabic*: and that the *Hebrew* word has two roots, because the *Arabic* has two senses: And that the perfect root signifies a *menial servant*, because the imperfect one signifies both *hired* and *commanded*; and that it was once so in *Hebrew*, because it is so now in *Arabic*; if you allow all this string of suppositions, and observations not pertinent to the point, the inference destroys all that all this pains has been taken for: for *Ale* and *Ale*, tho' different roots, will by all these examples be proved to be of the same meaning: the difference in the $\aleph$ only relating to the manner of deflecting the roots, not affecting the sense of them at all. As *Cælum* in the plural *Cæli*, come from the same thema, and signify the same, tho' the latter is not the regular plural of the former. And thus after reasoning and proving thro' seven or eight pages, the Doctor is obliged to give up the only thing in dispute, and against which the immoveable $\aleph$, was with so much pomp produced, *viz.* the meaning of *Ale*, which like other words, declines differently in different parts of speech, and continues in sense the same. And I question
whether

whether this famous argument may not give rise to a proverb, by and by, and *argumentum ancillare* become a common saying, for talking till a man forgets whereabouts he is, and at last proves against himself. But I am partly invading another's province, who needs not my assistance, and to him I shall leave this instance of אֵלֵם, which in the respects it stands as parallel to אֵלֵה, has occasioned the Doctor so much trouble, and thrown him into so much perplexity. And I would recommend it to the more serious consideration of the Gentlemen our opponents, that there is not an instance in the whole *Hebrew* tongue of any root, which has an immutable *e*, in one signification; and a mutable one, in a quite different. Not one is pretended to be produced; were there a גֵּבָה with a mutable ה that signified *low*, as the other does *high*; or if one אֵמֵה signified *servant*; and the other instead of *more a servant*, signified *mistress*, they would be more proper instances to contest our sense of אֵלֵם upon. But surely the supposition of a double ה, of quite different significations in a single instance, and that the case in dispute, must pass for a meer arbitrary supposition which could owe its birth to nothing, but the stubbornness of controversy, and its *decisive* authority to a sanguine complexion. The dispute might safely be rested here; but it will be more satisfactory to take the objections in the order as they lay. And I shall now begin and go on with the *Review* regularly, and where there seems occasion,

casion, remark upon what relates to the argument as defended by myself.

The Doctor states the argument p. 30.

“ The visible preservation of ה in גבה, (and a few
 “ other roots,) in all inflexions as a verb, and
 “ along with the suffixes—contrary to the com-
 “ mon rule of verbs, and nouns ending in ה, of
 “ which there is a great number, and in which
 “ the ה is as constantly observed to be *changeable*
 “ into other serviles,—”

but not always *changed*; and in some cases is *unchangeable*.

“ —By which it appears that the ה in גבה—re-
 “ tains the properties of the unchangeable letters.”

And is an exception to *all* the rest, in its manner of forming several of its deflections. And it follows by all this reasoning that the ה in אלה is not an *unchangeable* one, because it changes as a verb, and along with the suffixes. Unless its not *changing* as a masculine noun be a proof against all the rest. And we must see by and bye, for it is not spoke to here, why אלה must deflect regularly in all parts of speech because גבה does; supposing it to do so. And the next question is, why גבה may not be *regular* and *irregular* in several deflections as well as, almost, all the rest of the verbs in ה, as before observed, in some.

The Doctor first takes it for granted that the ה in גבה is as much unchangeable as the *unservile* radicals themselves, because it is retained in all deflections. And then argues p. 31.

“ That

“ That no word in which ה is wanting, or in
 “ which ה is found *changeable* (I think he should
 have said changed) “ can be deemed a derivation
 “ from גבה. And this, says he, is a fact deserv-
 “ ing attention, and is the special point to which
 “ my opponents should have replied directly. — ”

And so they have; see for me, *Script. Mean.* p. 16, 17. by shewing that other words in ה, are *regular* and *irregular* both in the same parts of speech; tho' not in so many as this word is. גב, גב' and גבן, may belong to this root notwithstanding this fact, as well as יעלה and יעל, &c. do to the same root. The *fact* I do for the present yield, but I want now, and I called for it before, something to shew the connection betwixt his premisses and consequences. Why the ה in גבה is *unchangeable*, because not *changed*, (which two words the Reader may observe are frequently slippt upon him, one for the other) or why every other ה that is not changed should not be deemed *unchangeable* too? We have seen how close this question pressed the Gentlemen, by their answers to the instances of נורה and אמה. And I have another to offer presently; if its vote may be allow'd good *non obstante hypotetica metathesi*.

גבה forms several of its deflections in a manner no other word in ה, in the tongue does. But גבהא Ezek. xxxi. 5. I apprehend is a foreign termination, as the Prophet lived among those who had different dialects from the *Hebrew*. We have another foreign word, ver. 5. and another ch. ix. 8. viz. גאשאר. Which are far out of rule
 as

as *Udal* and *Martinius* observe. There is another ch. i. 14.

“ —In the participle it is מַבִּיָּה like מַפְקִיד.”
 And so it is מַפְתִּיָּה from פָּתַח, *Hof.* ii. 14. עֲרִיָּה
 from עָרָה *Ezek.* xvi. 39. עָטָה from עָטָה
Cant. i. 7. אָנִיָּה from אָנָּה. טָרִיָּה from טָרָה.
 נָהִיָּה from נָהָה see *Mar. de Cal.*

“ I say, says the Doctor, the manner in which
 “ this verb is formed should be accounted for—”

p. 32.

Ufus, quem penes arbitrium &c. is a sufficient
 account why this is formed one way, and others,
 another.

“ —Instead of drawing consequences from a
 “ *supposition* of its being *anomalous*.”

This is premature; and he should have staid, till
 the instances which are offer'd as proofs of its being
 anomalous, had been shewn to be no more than
suppositions. Such language only shews that he
 has prejudged the cause.

“ The producing a few nouns that have—not the

“ ה, makes nothing against the nature and pro-

“ perties of this verb.—”

But the question is, what are the *nature and pro-*
perties of this verb? Which are not settled by
 shewing that it retains its ה in all deflections, be-
 cause it might drop or change it in all likewise, as
 other words do, in some; and some in one; and
 some in another.

“ In considering *the nouns*, we find גְּבוּהוֹת, גְּבוּהָה

“ come regularly from this verb,”

And so do בְּלוּהוֹת and בְּלוּהָה from בָּלָה, with a
 mutable

mutable ה. And it must not be said, that they are put *per metathesin* for בהלה and בהלות, tho' dictionaries may be cited for it, unless some reason, some proof be produced. The bare *say so* of a *Kimchi*, or even of a *Buxtorf*, will not quite over-rule the evidence of our senses. They come regularly from בלה. And so says *Marius de Cal.* בלה a quo fit בלהה; (and adds, without any apparent reason for it,) pro בהלה *per metathesin*. And the verb and noun have the same meaning, let who will examine the places they are used in, tho' somewhat differently translated. The verb, *corruptus, consumptus, vetustate attritus*. And the noun *interitus, perditio, turbatio, and terrores*. *Deut. xxix. 5.* "Your cloaths are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot." *Isai. li. 6.* "The earth shall wax old, (wear out) as a garment." *Ezek. xxiii. 43.* לבלה נאפים; where it is not changed, tho' feminine and *in regim.* *Psal. lxxiii. 19.* "They are consumed with Terrors, or wastings;" *Isai. xvii. 14.* "Behold at evening tide, בלהה trouble, (a blast or consumption) before the morning he is not. The Context so evidently points out what kind of trouble is meant, that we can't help seeing that the noun here carries the sense of the verb to wear out. A sudden consumption sent over night, and before the morning he is not." So *Ezek. xxvi. 21.* "I will make thee בלהה, and thou shalt be no more." בלה has a different sense; it signifies, (not terror, nor consumption, or wasting and wearing away, like

like the body of a man, a garment &c. but) *hast-ning, being in a hurry*. Mar. de Cal. Turbavit, terruit, *acceleravit, festinare fecit*. That sort of terror, if you will, which puts people in a hurry : or the *hurry*, which arises from fear. *Jud. xx. 41. Et festinavit יבהל vir Benjamin. 2 Par. xxvi. 20. Et festinare fecerunt eum. Prov. xx. 21. Hæreditas festinans, מבהלת hasten'd, at first. Eccl. viii. 3. "Be not hasty to go out of his sight."* It is plain that to *hasten* or be in *an hurry*, is the sense of this word. And not improperly translated by *terror* in some places, because, a *hurry* is often the effect of fear, tho' not always. But בלה and בלהות evidently carry the sense of *wasting away, wearing out*, and so the LXX and *Vulgate* translate the noun in many places. And so the Context directs us to understand it. And then Death is called in *Job*, not the *King of terrors*, but of *destruction*, all the various things, by which we consume and waste away, being under his command. And this instance comes fully up to what has been demanded; a word, whose ה is *mutable*, or changed, as a verb; and preserved in the noun both *singular* and *plural*, and that nine or ten times. It is, according to the custom and genius of the language, as the Doctor speaks, we see that *Ale* should form its noun *regularly*, but some other deflections *irregularly*. And the Doctor's argument, which he so strenuously maintains, that words which form like גבה in the noun *plural* must do so as a verb, or &c. fails him, and his inference, with it. viz. That *Aleim* must be derived

rived from some perfect verb in which the ה never changes or is lost, as גבה from גבהים. For supposing גבה to be ever so perfect a verb; the majority is on our side. There being three for us; and two only against us, in the view the Doctor himself states his own argument. We have אלה, אמה and בלה, and the Gentlemen on the other side, נגה and גבה.

How far גב, גבא, and גב' may belong to the same root with גבה, I shall leave to the Gentlemen who have proposed them as derivations from it. But I am at a loss for what the Doctor means by our

“ Not attempting to give a solution of these regular formations in גבה, and נגה.”

I have allowed him their *regular formation*, and have given a *solution* of his argument notwithstanding: and shewn him that it was both against *reason* and *usage*. But what it is he would have us solve else I can't tell.

“ —When at the same time (says he, p. 33.)

“ they pretend the ה is *as mutable* in these roots,

“ as in their אלה jurare.”

If by *as mutable*, he means as often changed in those roots, or in as many deflections, I think he has no foundation for the assertion; not in any thing that I recollect to have said.

“ —It is a point too difficult to be explained

“ upon their principles.”

Our principles, is the *usage* of the words by the Prophets of God, as they stand in the best, and most authentic MSS. that were to be met with, and unadulterated by apostate, or *Mahometan* mix-

tures. And where we meet with any thing that can't be explained upon these principles, we are contented with our ignorance.

What turn will be taken to avoid this instance of בלה I cannot foresee: whether the *metathesis* will be defended, or a double root will be made of it; but גבה is so much at heart, that the point will not be yielded. The meer authority of the dictionaries is given up; and no reason has been assigned for the *metathesis*. The sense of the word doth not require it; there are no MSS. to authorise it as a various reading. No, not among Mr. Kennicotte's seventy *correct and valuable* copies, as one may conclude from his silence after the great care and pains he has taken to discover every minute variation. And, upon the whole, it looks as if the Doctor, when he ventured to assert that this distinction would prove decisive against Mr. Catcott, thought his evidence would prove much more than it does.

The Doctor, p. 36, 37. espouses a notion that the ה is constantly immutable at the beginning of words; and blames my *grammar*, for

“ taking no notice of the instances where ה is never dropt, as in the beginning of roots, universally.”

I thought I had reason for not giving such notice, because I could never observe any such rule. הלך is a root according to the *dictionaries*, and the ה must be radical, by Gen. iii. 8. מתהלך; and yet drops its ה *numberless* times. הגה drops its initial ה; conf. Lam. iii. ver. 32. “ For if הגה he cause grief”; with ver. 33. “ He doth not afflict

“ flict willingly, nor **יָגַה** grieve the children of
 “ men.” The ה in **יָגַה** is evidently dropt be-
 fore the *jod* in **יָגַה**. That the ה is *radical* see *Ifai.*
xxxi. 4. xxxviii. 14. and lix. 11. as well as
 used in the same sense with **יָגַה**; being applied to
 the *growling* of the Lion, and *moaning* of the
 Dove. Which in language, is *grief* and *complain-*
ing. They put the *nouns* mostly under **יָגַה**, and
 the *verbs* under **יָגַה**. As *muttering* and *complain-*
ing, are often synonimous; so are *muttering* to
 one's self and *meditation*. And if the Reader's cu-
 riosity will lead him to take a concordance, and
 run over the Texts under these two words, he
 will soon see that the *same idea*, as well as the
 common rules of grammar, will connect both
 under the one root of **יָגַה**. This word is very
 properly applied to the *busling* and *splutter* which
 impure mixtures make in fusion. *Prov. xxv. 4.*
הָגוּ סִיגִים מִכֶּסֶף. Dross *mixed with silver* causes an
 ebullition, to use the chymical term; an in-
 ward ferment, or fretting.

הִמָּה is divided into five or six roots. It is con-
 strued a multitude, tumult and confusion. As a
 pronoun, *them*; which sometimes drops its *initial*,
 and sometimes its *final*, ה; as it doth in other
 parts of speech. **הִמָּה** is made one root, *Marius*
de Cal. Tumultum fecit, turbavit. Exod. xiv.
24. הִמָּה troubled the host. This is from **הִמָּה**. *Pf.*
lxvi. 4. The waters thereof הִמָּה are troubled. This
 is from **הִמָּה**. And so is *Pfal. lxxxiii. 3.*
Thine enemies הִמָּה make a tumult. Jud. iv. 7.
 His chariots and his **הִמָּה** *multitude*, this is from
 הִמָּה

הַמִּן. And so is 1 Sam. xiv. 19. and 2 Sam. xviii. 29. disorder, tumult, confusion. *I saw a great tumult, but I knew not what it was.* These are apparently the same root. And תַּהוֹם vorago, abyssus, aqua multa, will pass perhaps for a derivative from the same easily. And so possibly may יוֹם day; if we consider what the fluid is, which is called day, in contradistinction to darkness which is stagnate. And מַיִם waters, as well as יָם a sea, may come from hence too, as גֹּן the noun for grief does from the verb הָגָה, with the formative jod, the ה dropt.

But תַּמָּה, which is made another root of still, will not be so readily given up, because it is one of their perfect roots in ה. Gen. xliii. 32. "The men תַּמָּהוּ marvelled one at another." Were in such a maze, as people are when they are in confusion, and don't know what to do or say. *Isai. xliii. 8. "They shall be amazed one at another."* Look at one another in confusion. And so amaze, disorder, and put themselves into a bustle. The word is in *Hithpael*, says Cocceius, *Hab. i. 5. וְהִתְמָהוּ et ad invicem miramini.* So take away הַת the sign of the tense, and the plural ו; and there remains only מָה, from הַמָּה, for the root. And we have here a mutable ה preserved in the third Person plural as in גָּבַהּ. So *Isai. xxix. 9. הִתְמָהוּ* put yourselves into an uproar, and be boisterous, tumultuous; הִשְׁתַּעֲשְׂעוּ (another word in *Hithpael*, and its radicals doubled and followed by its verb in *kal*,) shout to one another נִשְׁעוּ and cry out. *Psal. xlviii. 6.* is the only place

place where there is any appearance of the ת being *radical*: and that is owing to the versions.

“ The joy of the whole earth is mount *Zion*—

“ for lo, the Kings were assembled: they passed

“ by together. They *looked*, כִּן תִּמְהוּ *it so amazed*

“ *them*, they were troubled and hastened away.

“ Fear took hold upon them there; and pain as

“ of a woman in travail.” It is only used as a

verb; in *Hithpael*. In the second Person plural:

and here in the third Person feminine, it is used

as a noun, but twice, (as supposed to come from

this root, I mean). *Zech. xii. 4.* “ I will smite

“ every horse בְּתִמְהוֹן with *fury*, and its rider

“ with madness.” It is translated by *stupor* and

astonishment: but it is such an *astonishment* as arises

from confusion and disorder. So *Deut. xxviii. 28.*

“ *The Lord shall smite thee with madness and blind-*

“ *ness*, and תִּמְהוֹן of heart.” I submit it to the

Reader whether this doth not mean that inward

confusion, disorder and tumult which is spoke of

Jer. iv. 19. לִבִּי הוֹמָה לִי. *Cor meum tumultuans*

mibi. And *xxxi. 20.* “ My bowels הִמּוּ are

troubled.” Here seems good reason for thinking

that the noun תִּמְיוֹן and the verb הִמּוּ, as well as

the participle הוֹמָה, are from the same root. The

sense requires it. And the formation of nouns with

a ת, and the *mutability* of ה, are well known. The

derivatives, under the several heads, being all re-

ducible to the same root, both by the rules of

forming the different parts of speech in other

words; as also by the *one general sense* that runs

thro' them all, I hope I shall be excused in offer-

ing **המה** as another instance of a mutable **ה** preserved in almost as many deflections as that of **גבה** is; and which changes or drops, occasionally, both its *final* and *initial* **ה**. And is as glaring an instance of the wrong division of roots in the dictionaries as could be desired; as well as another proof that the *initial* **ה** is not so *universally* preserved as the Doctor seems to have thought.

הדר seems to be another root whose initial **ה** is mutable, which the Reader may look for instances of under **הדר**. And if he have *Marius de Cal.* by him, any of these searches will be easily made.

I produced a place or two where **גבה** seems to change its **ה**. viz. *Lev. xiv. 9.* and *Ezek. i. 18.* compared with chap. x. 12.

“ I think, says the Doctor p. 39. the proof can
 “ scarce be plain to himself, because he has laid it
 “ so obscurely before his Readers. He *seems* to
 “ take **גבת** in *Leviticus* to be singular, and yet
 “ supposes it the same with **גבת** suffixed in
 “ *Ezekiel*, which he *allows* in his appeal to
 “ *Pagnin's* version to be plural.”

whether I have allowed it or no, it is very evident I argue upon the contrary supposition. And it is Mr. *Kalmar*, who seems to have misled the Doctor here.

“ If then, says Mr. *Kalmar* p. 6. **גבתם** and
 “ **גבהם** be plural, as Mr. B— himself ac-
 “ knowledges—”

which the learned Gentleman proves by saying, (just above) *I could not but confess it.* But gives
 no

no reason why I ought to confess it. And says at the bottom of the page, as the Doctor does, that *he suspects I take them for a singular*. The Doctor thinks that I confess they are *plurals* by giving *Pagnin's* translation; but I did not refer to *Pagnin* for the *number*, but idea, of the word. *The two supposed distinct roots, say I, are both construed to the same sense.*—גַּבַּת עֵינַיִם Lev. xiv. 9. is construed *supercilium* by one, and *eminentia oculorum* by another. But I did not mean that they translate it by a *singular noun*, for I was not thinking about the *number*, but the meaning of the word. And I am sorry for the trouble this in all probability has given the Doctor in searching for the *interpreter* who used the word *eminentia*, the force of which he hath ingeniously avoided by supposing it the *neuter plural*. But I confess I had no suspicion that גַּבַּת was supposed to be *plural* in form, tho' it might be in sense. So little regard have I to the *specs* and *dots*, that I read the Text in the pointed copies without seeing or thinking of them. But still *Marius, Leigh* and others will justify the construction by a *singular noun*, see under גַּבַּת. — *De Carne* in quâ sunt supercilia—vel carnem illam, vel ipsa supercilia. *Leigh*, supercilia, vel certe carnem prominentem in quâ sunt supercilia. And the obscurity the Doctor complains of is owing to the mist of pointing, thro' which he looked at my words, being prepossessed with a notion that there was a *vau* in גַּבַּת, which there is not. It may be *singular* in form, and yet *plural* in sense, as *the high of the eyes* would

be ; meaning, as *Leigh* and others explain it, the flesh lifted up above the eyes, in which the hair grows, and which is conceived as *part*, and the highest part, of the eyes.

“ The Context likewise, says the Doctor, directs
“ to the plural number—”

in *sense*, it might, but not *in form*. And if the word refer to the *flesh* of the eye-brows, it is singular in sense too, as much as the word *head*, in the same verse, tho’ there is a back part, and fore part to it.

“ Hence we see, says he, p. 40. that the *reading*
“ is גבוה —”

and contradicts himself in the next words,

“ The *vau*,—being suppressed.”

The *reading* is the *writing* ; and it is not writ so. But who *suppressed the vau* ? The Prophet or the Scribes since ? If the Prophet writ it as it stands, that is its *reading*. If others, he thinks suppressed it since, who were they, and when did they do it ? I hope the original Text, the record of our faith and hopes, is not to be supposed to have been corrupted, *meerly* because we don’t care to give up the rabbinical grammar. Nor does מלאה being joined to it (*Ezek.* i. 18.) prove it has, or ever had *vau* in it, as the Doctor seems to think, for it has no *vau* itself. Let us compare the Texts.

Ezek. i. 18. וּגְבִיהֶן and their Kings, הֵם
וּגְבֵהָ and there was height, tallness, to them
וּגְבוּתָם—, וִירָאָהּ לָהֶם, and terribleness to them.

The question is, what this word refers to. The Doctor refers it to גְּבִיהֶם ; I to גְּבֵהָ, meaning
th

that their whole *height* was full of eyes, from top to bottom, not the rings, *backs*, or *curvatures* of them only, if גְּבִיהֶם do refer to the wheels. Compare this with the parallel place ch. x. 12.

“ And all their flesh, and גְּבִיהֶם—and hands,

“ and their wings, and the *wheels* were full of

“ eyes.”

Their flesh, and height, i. e. their whole body *as high as it was*, as we should say, was full of eyes. The Doctor supposes, in which he follows Mr. Kalmar, that גְּבִיהֶם is the same word as גְּבִיהֶם chap. i. 18. But it is plain that גְּבִיהֶם here refers to the creatures or the *Cherubim*; and not to the *wheels*, which are separately mentioned afterwards. But there is another place where גְּבִיהֶם occurs, viz. 1 Kings vii. 33.

“ Their axletrees, and גְּבִיהֶם their naves, and

“ their felloes, and their spokes were all mol-

“ ten.”

How does this determine the dispute in the Doctor's favour, since it only refers to the word which has the *jod* in it; and so not to גְּבִיהֶם which has not; and which is the same as גְּבִיהֶם לָהֶם, and consequently as גְּבִיהֶם, *their height*?

But the Doctor is positive that

“ גְּבִיהֶם 1 Kings vii. 33. is the word wrote

“ גְּבִיהֶם Ezek. x. 12.”

For which if you will not take his word, he gives you that of Rabbi Dav. (misprinted for Rabbi Dev.) and then gives you גְּבוֹתָם מְלֵאוֹת with two *vau's*, as a quotation from Ezek. i. 18. where there is not one; and גְּבִיהֶם as from chap. x. 12. with a

jod, which even his *Jew* tells him is not there.

“ So that גבוותם מלאות, says he, in *Ezek. i. 18.*

“ and גבירם מלאים in *Ezek. x. 12.*——” *Review*, p. 40.

Would not any one expect to find those words in *Ezekiel*? The *Jews* point them as plural, but do not write them so. And this is carrying the presumption further than even the apostate race have hitherto dared to do, and taking a most strange liberty with the words of God. And proves that the Text will not serve the turn of the apostate *Jews*, and those who follow them, as it stands. They are forced to alter it to conform it to their rules; instead of bending their rules to the Text. Nor does the construction answer, even upon this alteration; for there was more than the rings, or the circumference of the wheels full of eyes, even the whole body of the compound creatures to their height or top. And this is what both Texts say, as they stand.

“ Thus far I have proceeded upon their construction.” says the Doctor, p. 41.
instead of saying *he had proceeded thus far upon an alteration of the Text.*

The dictionaries all construe גב by *eminentia*, *altitudo*; *excelsum*, *eminens altum*; *quicquid preminens et eminens*. See *Marius de Cal. Leigh, Buxtorf*, and I shall leave it to the Reader's judgement without saying any thing about it how far they are in the right; and how far *eminens* and *prominens*, and *altum* and *excelsum*, and so the two
roots,

roots, may be deemed the same: my own opinion being that גב and גבה are not the same, as I declared before; tho' the Doctor will not let me have the honour of agreeing with him in it. However it must be confessed that the Doctor and I are going against the concurrent authority of the Lexicons, in giving the words different senses; which he has treated all along as *crimen læsæ majestatis*. And if the *flesh above* or *elevated over the eyes* be not a good description of the eye-brows; or good enough to found an etymology upon, as p. 43. he may return it back to *Marius, Leigh*, and those others I borrowed it from. It is good enough for me, and I am contented with it. That being called *high*, and comparatively *higher*, which is lifted above the level of its neighbours. As a high back, and a high forehead, &c. are so called, not because they are at a great distance from the rest of the body, but because the first has a part higher than the rest; and the other because it is more elevated than usual. But I beg the Doctor would not father his corruption of the Text upon me, by calling it,

“ Mr. Bate's גבותם.”

I am satisfied with the Text as it stands.

I have not expressed myself distinctly the Doctor thinks in *Script. Mean.* p. 16. nor is he aware why I mention יעלה. I hope he is now, and might if he had pleased before. The *vau* in תלהו and such instance, may indeed, as he says, be part of the *suffix*, and I set them all aside.

But my next instance of מעשה in *regim.*
2
is more

is more to my purpose, tho' the ה in *such masculines in regim. were never* changed or dropped, as the Doctor says it is not. p. 45. And if it doth not prove that the ה may be *retained* or *dropped* at pleasure, it proves that a *mutable* ה is retained in some deflections, and may in others; and why not in the *plural*, or with *Suffixes*, when you have the same authority for it as you have for its being retained in the *singular* מעשה, viz. the evidence of your eyes? But the masculine ה is not always retained, as the Doctor seems to think. See Gen. v. 29. מעשנו: and Deut. xv. 10. בכל מעשך. So נוה keeps the masculine ה in *regim.* and drops it with a *Suffix*, as in נוך. And this instance of מעשה, and other such masculines in ה sometimes retaining, and at others dropping their ה, shews that *usage*, and not an *imaginary distinction* should direct us in tracing back the derivatives to their root. The *moveable* ה is retained in the *masculine singular*; and we see it in אלהים the masculine plural; and therefore have as much reason to conclude that אלה is its root, as we have that עשה is the root of מעשה; the מ being all that is *servile* in one, and ים in the other.

At dismissing this part of the dispute the Doctor is so condescending, as to take a second notice of my *Hebrew Grammar*; and correct it, for saying, that

“ ה is dropped *entirely* before the plural termi-

“ nation feminine, as מרכבה a chariot; מרכבות

“ chariots.” see *Review* p. 61, 62.

And is there a single instance to be found where
the

the *servile* ה is preserved in the plural? Do we ever meet with מרכבות, or any thing parallel?

“ But now, says the Doctor, we find the ה is
 “ not only sometimes changed before the plural
 “ termination feminine—but that *it* stands its
 “ ground invariably in that position, for we have
 “ גברות and נגרות, and more particularly
 “ אמהות several times.—”

But not the *servile* ה preserved in the plural in one single instance. In the Doctor's instances the ה is *radical*. Now if גברות were ever to be met with, he might with more justice reproach, as he does, *the Grammarian* with letting some things *escape his attention and notice*, which ought not: but none of my *rules and maxims are set aside*, as he seems to think, by the *radical* ה being preserved in the plural number.

“ —Instances, says he, so opposite to all the
 “ rules concerning the *servile* ה, as should never
 “ escape the *Grammarian's* attention and notice.”

Nor should the obvious meaning of a passage escape the Critick's attention and notice, however eagerly he may be bent to exercise his talent. The *radical* ה being preserved, is no proof that the *servile* ה is so, whatever the Doctor's attention was fixed upon, when he brought it for proof. And if I have not descended to *exceptions*, and pointed out every nicety, either because it would be tedious, or because I was not clear in them, I hope to be excused for what I have done. I wrote for the learner, not the master; to enable him to begin; not to finish him in so important a study:

a study : and if the Doctor or any body else will condescend to point out my errors and defects, and do it with good nature, I shall acknowledge the favour very readily, and think myself obliged to them ; but if it be done with taunting and sneering, I shall take the benefit of the information, tho' *the manner* will lessen the obligation to the person from whom it comes.

The Reader will now judge how far the Doctor's distinction, which he lays so great a stress upon, holds in itself ; or in its consequence against our etymology. He has taken great pains, and exerted his chief strength in proving *גנה* a perfect root : but the consequence remains yet to be proved ; that *Ale* must deflect like it as a verb, because it does as a noun. There might be a difference betwixt some roots in *ה* from others ; but why does it follow that one word is two roots, because another is a *perfect one* ? There is not an instance in the tongue of a word signifying one thing with a mutable radical *e* ; and quite another, with an immutable one. Their *Alab* and *Amab*, have no existence in the Bible ; nor in any author *coeval* by several hundreds of years, with *Hebrew*, while a living language, nor for aught that yet appears, in any author since. And Mr. *Kalmar's* *גנה* is a castle in the air ; it has no existence on the earth. And both the Gentlemen have been driven to the hard shift of *splitting the roots, which the learned in the language have hitherto held as indivisible*. And so give up that *authority* on which they build so much themselves ;
and

and take so many opportunities to raise the Reader's indignation against us, because we do not submit to it blindly and implicitly. At the same time that the Doctor objects to us *the authority of the Learned in distinguishing roots* which we consider as deducible under the same head; he himself confounds into *two*, what they have always considered as *one*. p. 63.

“ So the ה in *Amaboth*, says he, is a proof that

“ besides the אמה whose ה is mutable—”
meaning *changed*, in the singular number,

“ there is another אמה distinguished from it by

“ an unchangeable ה.—”

He should have said, *there was*, if he could prove it, for there is none now;

“ tho' the roots of neither of these nouns are

“ found in Scripture.”

And here is a contradiction in terms, as well as to all the Learned in general, *two different roots consisting of the same radical letters*; and this so smoothly expressed, as to appear a *plain truth*, to the deception of the Reader, and even of the Gentlemen themselves. And here it may not be improper to ask, how they knew that אלה and אמה, where they occur *unchanged*, do not belong to what they call *the perfect roots*? There is no mark upon the ה in those places; and if the ה be changed in other places, all they can argue from thence is, that the words in those other places, (such as אלתו, אלתך, and אמתו, אמתך &c.) are from the other of the two roots; if it be not talking without a meaning to call that *two*, whose

letters are the same. אלה and אמה occur frequently; the first *inter al.* Gen. xxvi. 28. "Let there be now אלה betwixt us." And the latter, Gen. xxi. 13. "the son of אמה;" by what criterion shall we determine that the one is not the supposed lost root of אלהים; and the other of אמהות? What difference is there betwixt אמה and אמה, or אלה and אלה, so as to distinguish one from the other? Not to ask here what should induce the first former or formers of the language to make two *roots* exactly the same, and then cast aside one of them without ever using it? But how do we know, because the Gentlemen have not told us, having all along taken it for granted, that the roots of *Aleim*, and of *Ameut*, do not occur, when the letters of these roots do? Had the Prophets designed to have given us those *imaginary* roots, they could have wrote them no otherwise than the *real* ones are in these places. The Reader will give this consideration its due weight; and will remember that the meaning of אמה, in *both its one roots*, is the same, *ex confesso*, as it is in all the other *irregularly* deflected roots.

When the Gentlemen called so often for another instance of a *mutable ה* retained in the *plural* number, and אמה, is pointed out to them, then to answer upon a *meer conjecture*, that it was once two roots, is such a manifest evasion, as deserves no more words to be used about it. And the self-contradictory supposition only shews a resolution that comes up to a *non persuadebis etsi persuaseris*.

אלוה *Review*, Sect. vii. p. 173.

I proposed to set what relates to grammar together; and there remains now only this Section to be consider'd, in which the Doctor contests with us some rules of Grammar that never were contested before; and this under the authority of the points, the authors of which not considering the genius of the language have set their specs and dots to such words as they supposed defective for want of those *servile letters*, by which the distinction in the parts of speech is kept up, where the Context doth not direct you without them.

“ Pluralis masculin. adjicit suo singulari ׁ” says *Bythner*, R. 31. and so say all the Grammars without exception. “ Hæc sunt omnia participia פקוד præter

“ participium præteritum *kal.* (vulgo *Pabul* a for-

“ ma) notat passionem adhuc durantem.” R. 52.

The participles, as in other languages, are us'd as *nouns*.

“ Participia non modo actum, sed et habitum no-

“ tant, ut שומר custodiens—et custos.” R. 42.

The participle *passives*, tho' it is not mentioned by *Bythner*, are also used as *nouns*; and carry their *passion*, tho' not *tense* with them, as שלום; *incolumitas*, *res salvæ*, *pax in qua est* ολοκληρία. *Vid. Cocc.* So כבוד is both weight, and that which is weighty. עשוק is *oppressed*; and *oppression*. And so in many other words. As many *latin* nouns are formed from the participle *passive*; as *oppressio* from *oppressus*, *pacificatio* from *pacificatus*, &c. Now to proceed.

The Doctor after spending a page or two to prove, that his opponents,

“ all take for granted, that אלה and אלוה are dis-

“ tinct words both in *sound*, and *signification*, ”
makes an assertion, that,

“ it is a known rule, as any in reading *Hebrew*,

“ that *vau* is often to be *sounded*, where it is sup-

“ pressed in writing. ” p. 175.

But he doth not tell us who made this rule; or where its vouchers are; nor observe that *this is the very thing in dispute*. But he says,

“ תולדת Gen. vi. 9. is the same word with תלדות

“ Gen. xxxvi. 9. ”

No. The first is *singular*, and the second *plural*. And the *vau* in the first, like the *jod* it stands for, may be dropped or retained; or like other words; with it, it is a *participial* noun; without it a *meer* noun. A word is the letters that compose it, and where the letters differ, the word must. The sense of different words, or the meaning of a writer in sentences differently worded, may be the same; but to say his *words* are the same when the eye sees the contrary, is an unguarded expression, and if the Doctor had not had a design in it, might have passed for a less cautious, tho' false assertion. The genius of every language differs; and some letters in *certain situations* may be used or omitted without affecting the sense, or violating the rules of Grammar; and which another language may not give you an opportunity of conforming to in a translation. And nouns of number, which are *singular* in *form*, but *plural* in *sense*, are common to all languages. There are many such in *Hebrew*. Gen. i. affords instances enough. Take ver. 24 and 28, only.

Let

Let the earth bring forth נפש חיה *and* בהמה *—have dominion over* דגת הים *and* עוף *the fowl of the air, &c. Several of these words are plural. Psal. viii. 8. and others in other places: Thou madest him to have dominion over—sheep and oxen, yea and* בהמות *the beasts of the field—and* דגי הים *the fishes of the sea, &c. So* נפש *is used singular and plural, and singular in a plural sense, as above. Ezek. xviii. 4. Behold* כל נפשות *all souls are mine. הנפש החטאת* *the soul that sinneth that shall die. Will any one say that* כל נפש *and* כל נפשות *are the same words; or that* בהמה *and* בהמות *or* דגת *and* דגים *with numberless others of the same sort, are the same words, tho' the sense comes to the same, whether you use them in the singular or plural? So neither are* תולדות *and* תלדות *the same words, tho' the sense comes to the same in both. Generation, or Generations, comes to the same, and preserves the distinction between them with regard to the last* vau *; but our language will not express the first.*

The Doctor goes on.

“ *Exod. ii. 14. is the same with* שופט *Isai.*

“ *iii. 2.* ”

The same in sense, as participles occasionally are in all languages. As *Amans* and *Amator*, &c. but this doth not confound the distinction betwixt the *participle* and *noun*.

“ קרוב, says he, frequently stands for קרוב and

“ רחוק for רחוק. So גדול and גבר for גדול and

“ גבור. Are they therefore not the same words?—”

No,

No, by no means.

“ —of the same signification ? ”

Yes, with the help of the Context. שפטים *Exod.* vi. 6. is the *same word*, as שפטים *Deut.* xvi. 18. but here, not of the *same signification*. What is it directs you to make the difference but the Context? So again, שפטים and משפטים are of the same signification in many places, are they the same words therefore, or in the same part of speech? רכב is generally used in a *plural* sense, is it therefore the same word, with its plural רכבים? See *Jer.* xvii. 25. &c. and *Isai.* xix. 4. קשה, is קשה the same word as קשים? And yet it must be construed as if it were; as much as קרב, &c. must in some places like their *passives*. I have observed before that the Context does often supply the place of the *grammatical signs*, both in the *verbs* and *nouns*, but where the Context does not, the word passes for that part of speech it is of without the *sign*; thus קשה must in the Text above be construed as *plural*; but take it from the Context and it will be deemed a *singular* by every body. And so will ארור and ברוך, *Gen.* xxvii. 29. tho' they are there *plural* in sense. Let the Gentlemen therefore when they propose רחק, as the same word, and of the same signification with רחוק, produce a place, where the Context doth not supply the want of the *sign*: or any one author good, bad or indifferent that would call רחק, קרב or &c. by themselves, *participles passive*. Or let them produce some passage where the Context directs you to understand אלה

as

as a participle passive, and if אלהים can be proved a *singular* or a *passive*, by the Context; and without confounding all the known and allowed rules of Grammar, let them produce their evidence and point out the places that justify such construction. But the instances hitherto brought are all beside the question.

The Doctor produces another instance in ארן.

“ Is יהוה הארן a different title, says he p. 176.

“ from יהוה הארון; hath the former an *active*

“ sense, and the latter a *passive*? ”

And he takes it for granted here that the *vau* is in the third order, and that the א is radical. But ארן occurs only as a noun, and the א may be servile, and *formative* (as in אורח from זרח *indigena*. אבטח *pepo*, from its clinging from בטח to trust in, or rely upon. אצבע the finger from צבע to point, or dip.) And it is sometimes writ with a *vau*, and sometimes without, which makes no other difference in sense than there is betwixt *amans* and *amator*. Or than betwixt תולדת and תלדת, before mentioned. דין or דון bids very fair for its etymology. The word signifies to order or dispose, to set things right, as a judge and master of a family do. See the dictionaries. But whatever be its etymology, the ideal meaning must be settled, before you can determine the propriety or impropriety of inserting or omitting the *vau*; and its root be found out before you can tell in what order the *vau* stands, and so whether it be *active* or *passive*.

The Doctor next asks the question, as if asking

ing the question was proving the point; Is אלה, a distinct word from אלוה, neither to be pronounced alike, nor understood in the same sense? It is this Gentleman's business to prove they ought to be pronounced alike, and understood in the same sense, not to beg the question, by asking it. If I were to turn the question, and ask him, why אלוה should not be pronounced like אלה, and be supposed to be the same word with it, what other answer could he make, but that there is a *vau* in the one, which there is not in the other?

“ אלה wrote, Deut. xxxii. 7. is wrote, says he,
“ at the 15th verse אלוה.”

He might as well have concluded the contrary, (the authority of the points being waved for the present) that אלוה in one, is wrote אלה in the other verse: And therefore he means or should mean that one word occurs in one verse, and the other in the other. But seems to think their standing within eight verses of one another is some sort of proof that they are the same word. But if the points are set aside, is there not one letter more in one word than in the other; and that in a situation where the difference betwixt *active* and *passive* depends upon it? And why not pronounce that letter in the word which has it, and omit it in the word which has it not. אדן I would pronounce *adn*; and אדון *adun*. And then inquire, according to the rules of the language, what sign the *vau* is here, and what difference it makes in sense? And so of *Ale* and *Alue*.

“ How the *vau* comes to be omitted in writing,
“ ing,

“ ting, I cannot say with any certainty; ”
says he;

nor will be informed how it comes to be put in; which is a worse case a great deal. It is very easy to see why those execrable wretches who hatched the accursed thing of pointing have put the *spec* to *Aleim* to make it a *passive*. They have renounced the Trinity and a suffering *Messiah*, and have been ever since busy in forging evasions of the evidence of those important doctrines in the old Testament. *Alue*, (as applied to One only of the Persons of Jehovah) asserts the Incarnation and Sufferings of that great Person. And *Aleim*, the *co-equality* of all the Three: it is easy now to see the source of the opposition Mr. *Hutchinson* has met with on this head. *Jews*, *Arians*, and *Socinians*, deny a Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and his *Satisfaction*, with the Sanctification and Assistance of the Holy Ghost. The *reputed* Orthodox have got notions into their heads about the Divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost, which destroy that *co-equality* and *co-eternity* which our Creeds assert, and without which the Essence could not be one and undivided. The Covenant of Grace they make a *pact* between the Father and the Son only. And that no *pact*, but only the will of the Father to give the Son. And the Holy Spirit is not mentioned at all as a party in making the Covenant, but is passed over in silence, or treated as a subordinate person. But to return.

The Doctor doth not know how the *vau* came to be omitted, but yet;

“ it is very obvious to conceive, he says, that

“ it was after the vowel points began to be used.”

Such an assertion has more mischief and poison in it, than the invention of the *points* themselves. They leave the letters as they stand; this corrupts the Text, and puts it out of the power of man ever to recover it. Before an assertion that reflects so much dishonour on the Providence of God, and his sacred Word, had been advanced, some evidence and proof equal to the importance of the case, should have been produced. The time when, the place where, and the particular persons who did it should be shewn. According to Bp. *Walton* and Dean *Prideaux* none of the copies were *pointed* till about the year of Christ 1030; and then a quarrel betwixt the *Jews* of *Palestine* and those of *Babylon* prevented their ever acting in concert, so as to agree upon what alteration and omissions they should make. Two standard copies were then prepared, which were followed, one by one party, and the other by the other; about which they disagreed, says the Bishop, “ *Non de dictionibus integris vel literis; sed de punctis, vocalibus, et accentibus.*” But supposing they omitted the *vau* in writing *Ale* a few times, how came they to leave it in *Alue* forty times? And if they left it forty times out of fifty in the word in the *singular*, how came they not to leave it *once* in the *plural*, which occurs so many hundreds of times? But the omission

sion by Transcribers is all *imagination*, espoused by the Doctor, *only* because it favours his argument, the credit of which, such bold assertions shew him more sollicitous for, than for the Text itself. And here the good man looks back with great regret after the *points*, which at setting out he discarded, tho' with some reluctance, from the dispute; and so agreed to argue upon the words as they now stand.

“ If any confusion, in the language, has arose, says he, “ from *dropping the textual vowels*——” prove them *dropt* first, before you build upon the assertion.

“ —It is owing chiefly, as I conceive, to the notion
 “ which is taken up by some, who absolutely re-
 “ ject the *points*, that two words, one of which
 “ hath the *vau* or *jod* inserted, and the other not,
 “ cannot be of the same pronunciation or signi-
 “ fication.”

We say no more here than the Grammars, and *all* before us in general have said, that the *vau* in the third order is *passive*, and which may be supported by above twice five hundred instances; however we have *the Learned* on our side here, and upon the credit of this rule, offer *Alue* as a *passive*, and in a different part of speech from *Aleim*, which has no *vau* in it; and the Doctor is driven to that wretched shift of *supposing the vau to be dropt out*, tho' when, where, and how no mortal can tell. But this very *supposition*, as well as the *points*, are sufficient proof that we are in the right in making such difference. They *fully*, tho' *tacitly*, confess,

that the *vau* makes a difference, because they are forced to put a *vau* into *Aleim*, (the Doctor by a *supposition*, the *Jews* by a *point*) to make it the plural of *Alue*; as they do also into *Ale*, to make it the same word with it.

The Doctor next begs the question again, that the pointing and pronouncing *Ale*, as if it were *Alue*,

“ has occasioned no confusion in these words, as
 “ Mr. *Hutchinson* pretends, *because* they are the
 “ same words, *when so pointed or so pronounced*,
 “ that this would be, if the textual *vau* was insert-
 “ ed——” p. 177.

But not the same, *when not so pointed or so pronounced*, as is fully confessed here. When *so pointed*, if you allow the authority of the points, they must construe the same; when *so pronounced*, they will *sound* the same to the ear; but that they are not the same in themselves, is acknowledged, by saying, *they are the same when so pointed, and so pronounced*. And saying, that “ this hath
 “ bred no confusion, *because* they are the same
 “ when pointed, as if they had the *vau*,” is giving that very *confusion* for a proof that it has bred none. This confounds two words into one; and makes those words to be of the same part of speech, which without it, *confessedly*, may not be so. Is not this breeding *confusion*; and arguing under the influence of it?

“ But Mr. C. has assuredly occasioned a great deal
 “ of confusion——”

I am glad of it ; as it is like to fall upon *Jewish* Apostacy and *Mahometanism*.

“ By reading אֱלֹהִים *Elah*, without any authority,
 “ and thereupon distinguishing it from אֱלֹהִים.”

So the writings of the Prophets are no authority. The Prophets have left it written so ; and infallibly distinguished it from a word with another letter in it. And a letter in such a situation, as the distinction of *active* from *passive* depends upon : and yet Mr. C. breeds confusion by following them, and has no authority for it. Strange language this from a Christian and Doctor of Divinity ! And though I ought and do suspect my own judgement, when set against Dr. *Sharp's*, yet as a *Protestant* I must see with my own eyes ; and as a Christian, am bound to bear my testimony, insignificant and worthless as it is, against such positions, come from whom they will, when I have an opportunity to do it.

“ The Reader may try, if he pleases, says the

“ Doctor, the effect of this distinction, on *Dan.*

“ xi. 37. and thinks Mr. *Hutchinson* plainly fore-

“ saw the difficulties arising from this passage.”

Let him try it there or elsewhere, if he pleases. But what are the difficulties that attend it ? Here are four words used for the Gods or Images of the Heathens, viz. *Al*, *Aleim*, *Ale*, and *Alue*. The first Mr. *Hutchinson* thought exprest *Irradiation*, an attribute of the light. The second became a name of God from the Covenant of Grace ; and the third, in the singular, for one of those *Covenanters* ; and the last, from the
 Curse

Curse which Jehovah had engaged to bear in and for man. The Heathens gave the same names to their Gods, and the Idols of them, that Believers did to Jehovah, and the *Representatives* of the Persons in Jehovah. And used, tho' differently modified, the same emblematic creatures, and *insignia*, and their sacred imagery. They had the same system of rites and ceremonies, which descended to them from their common ancestor *Noah*, tho' it gradually degenerated, till it became at last an utter abomination for its manifold impurities, cruelties, and other diabolical abuses. This prediction of *Daniel's* reaches almost as low down as to the coming of Christ, when the religion and languages of all those countries were become quite different things; by carrying the people into captivity, and destroying their sacred images. The *Assyrian* empire was overturned by the *Chaldean*, and the *Chaldean* by the *Persian*, and that by the *Grecian*; and during these commotions the *Hebrews* and their tongue were spread through all countries, tho' the dispersion lost them the common use of their language, and they did, as no doubt other nations did, learn the language of those who carried them away captive; or at least corrupted their own with a mixture of it. But as *Alue* was the common name among the *Jews* of a person they acknowledged for God, and who was represented in the Cherubim by the head of a Man joined to that of a Lion; by the Scape-Goat, the Passover, Burnt-Sacrifices, &c. what wonder if the Heathens

thens had this name also, as well as all the rest? Tho' it may be dubious what they meant by a word so low down as this, when the antient languages were so much changed. But supposing the word to be *Hebrew*, and to be used by the Prophet as a name of a God, how does this affect its etymology? Ver. 37. "*Neither shall he regard the Aleim of his fathers; nor the desire of women,*" (whether this means the great First-born, who was the desire of all nations, and more particularly of the mothers who bore him *in succession*; the strength of which *desire* appeared in Eve's joy on the birth of *Cain*; in the struggle betwixt *Leah* and *Rachel*, &c. &c. may be consider'd) "*nor regard any Alue,—thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange Alue whom he shall acknowledge, and increase with glory.*" This was some Image, we see, that he was to set up in glory; a *strange one*; with such *insignia*, and in such a form as was unknown before, something like that perhaps which we call a *Satyr*; half man, *half beast*; or a mixture of that which the *beast*, whether *Lion* or *Ram* represented, *viz.* God, and man; so the Incarnation and Suffering of God in man. Such an Image might properly be called *Alue*, in our sense, *the Person*, the Execration. What notions this King might have of an *atonement*, or satisfaction to be made to divine Justice, we are not told. The Heathens all had confused notions about it; and offered their own children to appease the Wrath of their Gods. And their Priests cut themselves,
and

and shed their blood upon the Altars, as 1 Kings xviii. 28. with some motions, and gestures that seem to aim at representing their desire of having Justice or Vengeance *lamed*; for they *פָּטְרוּ* upon the Altar ver. 26. which no doubt they had some meaning in. Be that as it will they all had some notions of the *Atoner for Sin*. And calling an Image *Alue*, *he*, the *Execration*, was ascribing the power of *atoning*, to him, or it, the Image represented. Their notions must differ from those of the *Jews* on this head; because the *Jews* expected *Jehovah* in flesh; but the Heathens were *without God in the world* worshipping the elements.

Whether I have stated the difficulty supposed to be in this passage of *Daniel* right, according to the Doctor's conception of it, I can't tell, because he hath not told us what he conceived it to be. Or whether the difficulty be in the promiscuous usage of *Ale* and *Alue*, as if they were common and the *same names*, for this *strange God*; —if this be the difficulty, I reply that *Al* and *Aleim* are used in the same promiscuous manner. And I suppose they are not the same words *differently written*; only the one *more fully* than the other. God is called in Scripture, in the same passages, *Jehovah*, *Adoni*, *Aleim* and *Al*. Are these all the same names, and of the same signification, for that reason?

Mr. *Hutchinson* was of opinion that the word is used as *Chaldee* in this passage of *Daniel*; to which Dr. *Sharp* replies, that

“ the

“ the whole chapter is pure *Hebrew*, and has not
 “ one *Assyrian* idiom in it.” Note, p. 179.

What then is רבאות ver. 12. and חמא ver. 44.? They are not *Hebrew*. And *Daniel* uses *Alue* as the name of a God that was not to be set up till the reign of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and so it might be a *Chaldee* or *Assyrian* word; what God *Antiochus* worshipped, or what he called him, we are not told any where else. It was an *Assyrian* that used the word to *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 15. in a speech in *Hebrew*; and as one of the names the *Hebrews* called *Jehovah*, the King of *Israel* by, was *Alue*, it was as properly used by him on this occasion, as *Aleim* or *Al*, and implies that the neighbouring countries had one whom they worshipped as God under this title. Which might very well be; they having all formerly had the same God and hopes in Christ, which the *Jews* then had, and so might retain this among the other names; tho’ they had lost the Faith in Christ.

Next the Doctor would make אלהים the plural of אלה, and so to have a *passive* signification.

“ — Why may not אלהים be the plural of one
 “ as well as the other?” p. 179.

He should rather have told us *why it may*, than have asked *why it may not*. There is not one rule of Grammar, he can cite for it. The two words may be different parts of speech, and differ as much as *Execrator* and *Execratus*. The asking whether קרובים is not the plural of קרוב is only repeating the question, without bringing any proof: for they differ just as the other two do.

And have their *regular* distinct *singular* and *plural*; tho' by the *Context* they may sometimes construe the same; but doth *Aleim* ever once stand in such a situation that you must construe it as a *passive*? And we have now shewn that *Jehovah* has in *Mercy* and *Condescension* to us performed an act, which denominates them the *Agents*, and so puts *the voice* out of question.

The Doctor goes on with his endeavours to confound the distinction betwixt *active* and *passive*; and *singular* and *plural*; and might by the same way of reasoning confound that too between all the other parts of speech, as I could easily shew.

"The plural of תהום *Abyssus* is תהומות," says he. No, its plural is תהומות, *Psal.* xxxiii. 7. &c. but then he rejoins,

"May it be supposed that תהמת, *Exod.* xv. 5, 8,

"&c. is not the plural of תהום?"

No more than בהמה, נפש &c. are *plurals*, *Gen.* i. 24. or than *beast*, *creature*, &c. are the same word as *beasts* and *creatures*, in other places, because they mean the same. It being the same thing to say, *God created the living creature, and the beast of the earth*, as that *he created the living creatures and the beasts*. So *water*, and *waters*, speaking of a quantity together, mean the same thing; and תהמת in the Texts above, as a noun of number, may have a *plural* or *singular* verb with it. Whether the Doctor be in earnest here, and really giving us his own opinion, or only trying how far such suppositions would weigh against us,
or

or shewing that he can mortify us with *puzzling* objections, that we may not *be too sure* we are in the right, I cannot tell; but one would think he must know better. Suppose he could really prove, or which is much the same thing for the present, could make it appear, as if the Prophets did not write by any grammar rules, and that the *unpointed Hebrew* is not intelligible; does he think he could support the antiquity, authority and tradition of the points, so as to satisfy mankind, and set them down contented with that wretched *succedaneum*? Or is it the same thing to have the Records of our Faith in a language, whose rules, like those of all other languages since, are in itself; as in a writing whose construction must depend upon *dots* and *blots*, and a parcel of *specs*, which the enemies of that Faith, which these books contain the evidence of, have set to the letters? If the *words* have *Grammar* in them, we may be as sure of what the Prophets meant, as we are what the evangelical Writers meant. If we are forced to go to the apostate *Jews* to construe the *Hebrew* Bible for us, we had better have been without it. The Reader sees here what minute difficulties the rejection of the *points* would involve us in. Dr. *Sharp*, whether really in earnest or no, has urged, we may depend upon it, all that can be urged. And what does it amount to? Why words in some situations construe the same without the *vau*, as they do with it in others. A singular word comes to the same *in sense*, sometimes, as the *plural* of it. Participles are used

for nouns, and the parts of speech can't be determined, *in many places*, i. e. be made to conform to the *Latin*, without the help of the Context; or in other words, the same word shall in *Hebrew*, as in *English*, be masculine or feminine, active or passive, singular or *plural*, as the Context requires it. And yet one who understands the tongue shall easily avoid all those ambiguities, which an unskilful writer shall fall into.

There are two instances produced by the Doctor, *viz.* אֲדוֹן and תְּהוֹם, and he might have produced another or two, as יוֹם, which do not always retain their *vau* in the *plural*: but they are not parallel to אֱלֹהִים. It is not certain that the א and ת are not *serviles*; and their *vau* in the second order; so that with it they are *participles active*, and without it *nouns*; which makes little or no alteration in the sense. But *passive* and *active* make a great difference in sense, and in some words more than in others. I have cited the rules, and by them we see that ׁ added to the *singular*, makes the *plural* masculine; and *vau* in the third order is *passive*; and words without it construe as the Context requires it: and he who is ever so little conversant in the unpointed Text will see that this breeds no confusion.

The Doctor seemed to doubt, in the *Dissertations*, whether *Aleim*,

“ tho' it has a plural termination,—may not yet

“ have the signification of a noun singular.” p. 71.

And Mr. Kalmar, says, p. 25.

“ it may either have, or not, a plural signification.”

And they instance in several words that they think are *plural*, in form; but *singular*, in sense. But they have not proved that they are any of them *singular*, in sense. But suppose so, Are there not plural verbs, participles and pronouns used with *Aleim*? Is it not said *ye are Aleim*, speaking to Princes? And this in the Text of the Sermon the Gentlemen undertake to confute, and yet they always forget to reconcile their interpretation of the word to the Text. All writers in general, except *Aben Ezra* and an Apostate or two more, are agreed, that it is plural in sense as in form, tho' they did not know how to reconcile it to their notion of its being a *passive*. This has been shewn at large over and over again, but the Gentlemen think proper to repeat and endeavour to strengthen their doubts of its *plurality*, without taking any notice of the collateral evidence for it. And if the sense of a few words, (which however doth not yet appear) did differ from their *form*, we have reason enough to be sure, that this is not one of them, if any such there be. If the reason of a *plural termination* doth not always appear, we are not sure there was not one; Mr. *Kalmar* instances in *זקנים*, *עלומים* and *בתולים*; but he has not shewn their meaning or proved them *singular* in sense; unless translating them by *old age*, *youth* and *virginity* be a proof. *Days* or *years* may be understood in the two first: as time is divided into several portions and periods, *younger days*, and *advanced years*, or something of that kind (as *על* is *bidden*, retired, as in youth, and

and *יְדִי* grown old,) would clear the objection from these words. And the other is always understood to include *marks* or *tokens*, whatever they were, in it. Virgins wore a peculiar dress and particular *insignia*, and upon that account the word may be *plural*; and thence signify the state or years of virginity. But all these instances are besides the question, when *Aleim* must by rule be *plural*, and we have such full evidence otherwise that it is so. As we have also that it is not a *participle passive*, but noun, which there appears no reason from the Text to construe in a *passive* sense, did not the meaning of the word also prohibit it.

Philo Biblius translated *Sanchoniathon*, and *Eusebius* has preserved a fragment of it, which the Doctor offers as a proof

“ that the antient traditions—confirm the inser-

“ tion of the *vau* in sounding *וְהָיָה*—*οι Συμ-*

“ *μαχοι* *ελωειμ* *επεκληθησαν.*” p. 180.

But *Philo Biblius* is not *antient* enough to prove the *Hebrew* pronunciation of the word, by seven or eight hundred years. The *Syriac* pronunciation is another thing. And the Apostates by *Philo Biblius*'s time had hatched most of their evasions of the evidence for Christianity from the *Hebrew* Text. But if this fragment favour the sound, it destroys the sense the Doctor would give the word. These *ελωειμ* were not the adorable Gods, but *Συμμαχοι*, *commilitones*, item *Fæderati*. See *Scapula*. Which comes so near our sense of the word, that if we may suppose, as we have but this short account of them, that they were such

such Heroes as the *Horatii*, and *Leonidas* and his men, who devoted themselves to Death for the good of their country, making themselves Sacrifices to it, they might be called *ελωειμ*, in the passive sense of the word, *men who made themselves a Curse* for it. But if they were called *עלהם* (in *Philo's* time pronounced *eloeim*) only for being *Confederates*, under Oath, as having sworn to stand by one another, the Doctor has lost a great deal more in *sense*, than he thought to have got in *sound*; and this fragment, tho' not *impertinently*, yet is very *incautiously* brought, because it sets aside the greatest part of what he has been contending for. And the other instance of *ελισν* for *עליו* would lead one to think that the *ω*, in the first, did not stand for a *vau*, since it is so plain that *ε* stands for it in *ελισν*. And one instance weakens, if not destroys, the inference from the other; for *Philo* would have wrote *ελξειμ*, not *ελωειμ*, had he intended to have expressed a *vau*.

Origen might have his *Hebrew* where *St. Jerome* had his; and to be sure would have thought it as great a sin to pretend to be wiser than his Teachers, as some who arrogate to themselves the imaginary dignity of *Fathers* do now.

The Doctor words the next Section with some Caution.

“ We have better authority still for the pronun-

“ ciation of the *singular* by *Eloab* or *Elob* from

“ *St. Mark*, who writes the word, used by our

“ Saviour on the Cross, *ελωι*.” p. 181.

We may have authority to write the *singular*
עליו,

אלה, which hath a *vau* by *Elo* ; but you have no authority for *Eloab* or *Eloh* either, from St. *Mark* ; or if you have authority for *Eloh*, you have none for *Eloab*. St. *Matthew* writes a word for *my God*, by *ηλι* ; and the Doctor seems to take it for granted, that St. *Mark* and he meant the same word. Whereas it is very plain that our Lord spoke to God by different names, and called upon him above once, and cried out, *Eli* and *Eloi* both ; and consequently that St. *Mark* did intend to refer us to the Hebrew word אלוה. The case appeared so plain to me, (and I believe it will to the Reader, if he look at what has been wrote upon it, *Examiner Examined*, p. 63. *et seq.*) that I said, perhaps too ludicrously, that *I would refer it to any old woman*. An appeal, which Doctor *Sharp* has been pleased to take to himself, and give the point in my favour. For p. 183. he says,

“ If St. *Mark* intended to refer us to אלוה,

“ which I think it will be readily allowed he did.”

I have the Doctor's decision in my favour then, that St. *Mark's* *Eloi* stands for אלוה ; which is all that I referred to the old woman about ; tho' he misquotes my words, and represents them in his less-exact way of citing, as if it had been the propriety of applying this word to the second Person, which I had referred. Conf. *Review* p. 182 and *Examiner Examined* p. 63.

“ He has indeed, says the Doctor, lodged his

“ appeal in the safest hands for himself ; for if he

“ had referred the matter to persons of more sense

“ and

“ and judgement, he could not have hoped for
 “ their decision in his favour.”

And yet I have Dr. *Sharp's* decision, *mal apro-*
pos, in my favour; and contrary, it seems, to his
 intention.

In the two next pages the Doctor argues upon
 a foundation, which such unanswerable objecti-
 ons have been made to, *on the authority and in*
the words of our own Church, and they have been
 so often repeated by us, as the Gentlemen have
 repeated the argument without so much as once
 making any reply, (tho' the Doctor does acknow-
 ledge in his *Dissertations* that *we have insinuated,*
that the holy Writers had their reasons for using
 the *Greek* words for the *Hebrew*, which other
 people then did, tho' for *brevity sake*, he chose
 to pass by a consideration of them) that his argu-
 ing again here upon the same foundation, and
 opposing *the authority of St. Matthew to that of*
Mr. Hutchinson, is not consistent either with
 the deference due to the great men whose words
 we have replied in; nor with the character of a
 disputant; nor with the character of Dr. *Sharp*,
 as he gives it us of himself in his *Dedication*, and
Preface to his *Dissertations*, and occasionally in
 his *Review*, where he is all candour and ingenu-
 ity. — *si sic, omnia dixisset.*

“ — What should have hinder'd their giving Mr.

“ *Hutchinson's* meanings, had their meanings been

“ the same, in *Greek* words — ? ” says the Doc-

tor p. 185.

Why should you so often ask for an answer, that
 you have passed over for *brevity sake*, as often as

it has been given you, as it often has? However it may be seen in the *Translators* preface to our *English Bible*. And when St. *Matthew* says, *Eli, Eli, that is, my God, my God*; and St. *Mark*, *Eloi, Eloi*, which is interpreted, *my God, my God*, might they not mean, as it is in *Greek*, and interpreted by the words in use? Will the Doctor stand by this interpretation, and say that Θεός is a *participle passive*; and signifies *adored*; and is an exact translation of the *singular* and *plural* both?

“ Let me just further observe, (*says our keen adversary*) in passing, that St. *Matthew* wrote Ελι—”
No, St. *Matthew* writes ηλι,

“ —not αλει; and St. *Mark* Ελωι, not Αλωει,
“ as it should have been according to Mr. *Bate*,
“ Mr. *Moody*, and the *Christian Plan*. ”

And which of the Evangelists would the Doctor have us follow in writing the *Ν* in *English*; the *eta* of the one, or *epsilon* of the other; or *A* of them both, as well as of all the other inspired Writers in αβρααμ? The Doctor doth not seem to have considered what he objected to; the authority of the Apostles being as much for *A* as *E*, and never intended to determine us one way or the other; they conforming themselves to the received translation, in their words, and vulgar manner of pronouncing them, which was very irregular and arbitrary. However the authority of St. *Mark* is as much against the Doctor's way of writing the word, as ours; tho' he *did not see it*, when he objected that authority to us; for St. *Mark* neither justifies *Eloah* nor *Eloh*, but *Elo* only; and so our Translators pronounce it.

We

We come now to אלוה, *Review* p. 185.

“ Their verb אלה with a mutable ה, should make
 “ its participle passive אלו,” say our opponents.
 But this rule doth not hold in *Hebrew*. ענו and
 שלו *passives*, from ענה and שלה; and those that
 are formed in *jod*, without a *vau*, are all as much
 exceptions to the supposed rule, as our word is;
 and weaken, if they do not entirely set aside, the
 inference from it. See *Marius*, עני and ענו *afflic-*
tus. And עני and ענה *afflictio*; the *passives* be-
 ing used as *nouns*. So שלו *quietus*; שלוה and
 שלי (2 *Sam.* iii. 27.) *pax, quies*. אלוה therefore
 may be an exception, as well as so many others.
 And the Gentlemen seem to think so, because
 they have made no reply to this, tho’ it has been
 several times proposed to them.

Mr. *Hutchinson* instanced in גבוה as parallel to
 אלוה; Mr. *Bd.* objected on account of a *mappick*;
 when that could not be defended without defend-
 ing at the same time the whole fardel of *Jewish*
 corruptions, it was dropped; till Dr. *Sharp* re-
 vived it in another form, and argued from a dif-
 ference betwixt a *mutable* and *immutable* ה, of
 which they can find *but one* instance in the pre-
 sent deflection; and they have given no reason
 why one word in ה should not retain its ה in one
 or two deflections, as well as another in all. It
 is the *usage* of גבה they appeal to, and yet think
 it hard that we should appeal to *usage* in אלה.
 And we might as well reject their גבה as *Hebrew*,
 as they our אלה.

Mr. *C.* instanced in ערוה, this and many others
 of that sort were objected to as being *nouns*; we

answer'd, which was obvious enough, that might אלוה be also. And it appears further on examination, that the *participles* are used *nouns*; the objection therefore could do the Gentlemen no service, on both these accounts. And of both these points no notice has been taken by our opponents, that I recollect. There are, I believe, as many *nouns* formed in ך and ך, as *participles*; the many therefore that are formed in ך are all authorities for אלוה, whether *noun* or *participle*, the distinction depending upon the Context, or the words being either as they are applied.

דוה was another instance, construed *menstrua*, and *quæ patitur menstrua* by Marius de Cal. tho' the Doctor does not believe, he says, that Bate can shew one Lexicographer who takes it as a passive. p. 188. And דו and דוה are used promiscuously, whether as nouns or participles—inde nom. דוה at דו debilis, languidus—firmitas, ægrotudo. See Marius de Cal. Isai. x. 22. and Lam. v. 17. the heart דוה. Jer. v. 18. the heart דו. If one be a passive, we have authority and usage for the others being so. And the Doctor seems to allow it by saying, p. 186. “that because דוה happens to be once wrote
“דו.”

It happens to be six times wrote for it, but the Doctor says,

“it neither has a passive sense——” p. 187. it has the same sense as דו.

“Nor is it in the form of the participle passive. Not in his form, but it is in ours.

“If it were inflected like the perfect verbs, v

“ה final, it would be דוהה——”

And should it not also be דוּי, if inflected like the imperfect verbs in ה? Why may it not avoid the reduplication of the *vau* in one *voice*, as the other? The Doctor would make it an active because it doth not terminate in י; and objects to the *vau* being wanting in our case, which is equally wanting in his own. The sense of דוּה in the *passages* referred to in SS. and *Marius's* construction of it, the Reader will see and judge of for himself. Parallel to this, are דוּה and עוּה.

דוּה et דוּי satur, ebrius, irriguus et inebriatus. *Marius de Cal. Leigh. Crit. Sac. well liquored.* See *Isai. lvi. 11. watered.*

עוּה curvus, obliquus, contortus. *Marius de Cal. and Ezek. xxi. 27. thrice, perversam, &c.* our T. in the margin *perverted.*

I also produced וְעוּה, *Deut. xxviii. 25.* and appeal to our *Translation*, that it was taken in a *passive* sense.

“ But this sort of proof comes a little out of
“ course ” (p. 189)

from me it seems; and when “ *I condescended to*
“ *make use of it, I should have given the whole*
“ *word with its prefix, לוְעוּה.* ” The justness of which censure, and direction, I am at a loss for. The prefix is no part of the word; and if, as the Doctor says, note p. 190. that

“ substantives are commonly thus used, but par-
“ ticiples seldom if ever, ”

he weakens very much, if not destroys his own assertion, that אֱלֹהִים is a participle passive, the ל and other *serviles* being prefixed to it. *Deut. xxix. 13. et alibi.*

The *marginal* reading, a *removing*, and which I should in justice have cited, the Doctor says, is as much *passive*, as the *textual*; for *in commotionem*, for a *removing*, may mean *a thing moved and tossed about*; not *actively*, that they should *move others*, but that others should remove and drive them from place to place.

“ The versions all give it as a noun and every
“ Lexicographer. ”

But still it is parallel to אלוה as having a *vau* before a mutable ה; and call it participle or noun, we by the same authority may call אלוה either. And so are ענוה, גאווה, &c. &c. And so is לראווה, Ezek. xxviii. 17. And, it is not *sufficient to reply that they are all used as nouns*, p. 191. unless some reason had been assigned why their supposed rule should not hold in the nouns, many of which are formed in ו and וי, as well as in the *participles*; the *vau* being before a *mutable ה* in one as well as the other. And some of these nouns in וי preserve their ה *in regim.* unchanged, as their immutable root does: as ענוה, Psal. xlv. 5. and גאווה, Job xli. 6. But there is no such rule, as they build upon, existing, in the *Hebrew Bible*: tho' some words are so formed, others are not.

I have said, *Examiner Examined*, p. 73. that *vau in the third order is passive*.

“ If he means, says the Doctor, that *participles*

“ *pabui* have *vau* in the third order, it is true.---”

That is the rule I appeal to, and that is the general rule; if there be any exceptions to it, it is still the *general* rule; and he that would except any
parti-

particular word, whose *form* gives it the claim, from being within the letter, should assign some reason to shew it to be a particular case, and cannot justly argue in general. There are exceptions, therefore this is one. If the participles *pabul* have the *vau* in the third order, the *vau* in that order, is the *sign* of that participle. And they must be participles *pabul*, which have it there. The instance of *תהום* is not within the rule, the *ת* being (or say only, as it *may be*,) a *servile*, and the *vau* in the second order.

“ עשוק, (which the Doctor says) is active, and

“ signifies *Oppressor*, *Jer.* xxii. 3.”

is indeed construed so; but by rule should have been construed *oppression*, as so many other *participial* nouns are; and express the *action done*. What the Grammarians call *pabul*, is *the person affected*; this, *the thing effected*. Which is as much *passive*, as the other. So *oppression is the injury done*.

If קטול in *Chaldee* is *intersector*; that and other such instances, might first suggest to the *Chaldee Jews*, the evasion of *Alcim*, or their pronouncing it *Elohim*, and so *Eloah* in *Daniel*, might be only the *Chaldee pronunciation*. But in *Hebrew* such words are *passives*, all of them, as I take it.

אלוף, which is given as another instance against our *new rule*, or rather *old rule* a little enlarged, is misconstrued, as the last was: and according to rule should be the *Dutchy* instead of the *Duke*; the division or district governed by him. *Gen.* xxxvi. 15. “ *These are the Dutchies of the*
“ *sons of Esau,—the Dutchy of Teman, the*
“ *Dutchy*

Dutchy of Omar, " and so on. The *Govern-eds*, (to form a word after the *Hebrew* fashion, or *præfecturæ*,) not *the Governors*; and so in other places. *Psal.* lv. 14. not *Præceptor*, but *Disciple*, one instructed. *Prov.* ii. 17. *the Guide*, as it means the *instruction*, which she received in her youth. *Chap.* xvi. 28. *A Whisperer* separateth אֱלֹוֹן, as we say, a whole neighbourhood; sets a whole town at variance.

The *Hebrew* is an ideal language; and *names* are definitions or descriptions in one word, and sometimes two compounded. And the Reader must see the necessity of settling the *idea* of a word before the propriety or impropriety of the *grammatical signs* can be determined. And this more properly belongs to the rule about the *same-ness of idea in Hebrew words*, which is to be examined into by and by. And I shall only observe here, that an accurate translation, whether from want of an adequate word, in the Translator's language; or from his inattention; or being misled by others whose business it was to confound, or for any other accidental reason, the bare translation, I say, ought not to be looked on, as a sufficient explication of a word. The propriety of the *passive vau* appears in most words at first sight, and may upon examination in others.

חַנוּן *gratiosus*, and רַחוּם *misericors*, are *passives* in *form*, and in *sense*.

The root חן is *Grace*, *Favour*; what proceeds from good will or affection, not from reward or hire. We use the phrase of *pitching*
or

or *fixing* upon a thing we like; חָנֹן is one who acts from the affections being so *fixed*. One *fixed*; meaning, in affection. And I apprehend, the application of this word, which they make another root of, under חָנָה, to *fixing* any thing in the ground, as *pitching* a tent, and *fixing* a spear down, illustrates the idea of the word.

רחם. This word, says Leigh, *Crit. Sac.* signifies bowels and mercy; for mercy arises from the moving of the Bowels. Then רָחוּם is one so moved, and it is a passive. Gen. xliii. 29. His bowels רַחֲמָיו did yearn. Was not Joseph רָחוּם moved or affected in his bowels, at this time? Take one passage, the first in the Concordance, where these two words are used together. 2 Kings xiii. 23. The Lord יְהוָה was gracious unto them, and רַחֲמָם had compassion on them, because of his Covenant, and would not destroy them. His mind was fixed upon them, and his bowels were moved towards them.

גבור and הָרִוּץ are two other instances supposed to be *active* in sense, tho' *passive* in form.

גבר Marius de Cal. *valuit viribus, virtute, fortitudine, auctoritate.* And the *passive* גָּבוּר, Marius, *vir bellica virtute præditus*, not one who strengthens, or gives power and dignity to another; but endowed with it himself. One waxed or grown eminent. So David's mighty men, or men renowned for might. Deut. x. 17. The God, הַגָּדֹל the magnified, הַגָּבוּר the renowned for might, (whose might had been seen and acknowledged,) and הַנּוֹרָא terrible or feared.

הָרָץ, *movit, agitavit, quâdam alacritate, acu-*

it, Leigh. Whether *acuti*, be a proper translation of חרוצים, Prov. x. 4. "The band of (as we render it) *the diligent maketh rich*," I shall submit, without saying any thing in its behalf.

If I am so happy as to suggest an idea, or lead some into the meaning of a word, and be the cause of mirth to others, I shall think myself happy. And I flatter myself that it is not for very certain, that *I must be mistaken in supposing that every word which has a vau in the third order must be a passive*, whether it may come directly under the term *pabul* or no. And I have now gone thro' the *Review*, and passed nothing that relates to the sense of *Ale*, and the grammatical construction of its derivatives *Aleim* and *Alu* Words, which if they are fairly construed by Mr. *Hutchinson*, and if we can maintain the construction, will confound all religions but the Christian, and put the great Articles of it out of all doubt to those, who acknowledge the *Hebrew* Scriptures to be the Word of God, and original evidence of our Faith, which we are taught in every page almost, *not once by accident*, but every page almost of the new Testament.

Doctor *Sharp* has given us some trouble, and pleases him.

"I have been able it seems, to say something
 "pertinently, as to have excited, and exercised
 "the pens, of so many and so great *Adepts*, for
 "he, in the *Hebrew*."

Naughty language this for so good a man to use.
 But he has given us some trouble; and we owe ourselves more, than the objections, tho' not

dign

dignity of the Objector, deserve. Forgive us this wrong; but reproach us not with being *Adepts in Hebrew*, or for making it our own study, and doing what we can to encourage and facilitate the study of it in others. *Hebrew* is the language of God, and contains the records of our Faith. What, they call *Arabic*, the forgery of Antichrist, and *Syriac* and *Chaldee*, meer names! Strange, that being *Adepts* in SS. should be matter of ridicule; and the ecchoing out of *Syriac*, *Chaldee* and *Arabic* be deemed a piece of honour. *Micat ore Trilinguis*. It is easy for men of learning and *more than ordinary leisure*, to sit down and raise objections; and make whatsoever they please look plausible enough at first view; and perhaps at last, to almost persuade themselves into the belief of what was only at first started to *puzzle a cause*, (or like Orators at the bar, pleading for money or reputation,) to make the best of one side of a question only. This is often the case, when truth is *not the sole motive* of the contest; *as it confessedly was not of Dr. Sharp's taking up the pen in this dispute*. So whether he really thought his objections unanswerable or not; or would overbear our weakness by his superior learning and authority, and perplex us with difficulties, whose chief strength lay in the art of the Manager, I cannot tell. This I am sure of, that he must know some of them to be no more than nothing at all. And if he should at last be obliged to leave *the little Cavillers* in possession of the argument, his regret will be the less, if his value for the truth be the greater.

I have

I have now only my thanks to return to the learned Dr. *Sharp* for his advice to me at the close of his Pamphlet, tho' not for the charge of Heresy. But as he is pleased to lecture me with the humility of the holy Father, and charity of a Conservator of the Faith, I accept it accordingly: And beg leave to assure him that I have not forgot,

“ my attachments to the Doctrine and Faith professed in the Church of *England*.”

Which Doctrine is contained in the Homilies, Creeds, and Articles. The Catholick stile to the Clergy of our Church is that of the Creeds. There we read that

“ in this Trinity, none is afore or after another—

“ but the whole three Persons coeternal together,

“ and coequal.”

This I firmly believe. And if the Doctor can lay his hand upon his heart, and say he firmly believes it too, it is very well. And if some have taken, or mistaken, notions from others, and applied the terms in our Creeds which are relative to the Oeconomy of the Covenant, as explanatory of *the original of Persons who never began to be*, and thereby have confounded themselves and others, let them see to it, who, when all is made clear, intelligible and consistent, chuse to follow *persons* rather than Truth.

F I N I S.

Bate, Julius,

A Reply To Dr. Sharp's Review and Defence Of His Dissertations On The
Scripture Meaning Of Aleim and Berith

Bd.: [1]

London (1755)

Exeg. 1029 o-1/3#Beibd.1

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10412857-8